



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XXIII.—AMERICAN EDITIONS OF SHAKESPEARE:
1753–1866.

American criticism of Shakespeare began in 1753 with a New York woman, Charlotte Ramsay, best known as Mrs. Lennox. Until fifteen years of age she lived in America with her father, Colonel James Ramsay, Lieutenant-Governor of New York City. Thence she went to London and, being thrown upon her own resources, supported herself, both before and after marriage, by her literary labors. During her long life of eighty-four years (1720–1804) novels, poems, comedies, memoirs, and translations flowed from her prolific pen. That her intellect was of no mean order is known from Dr. Johnson's testimony. He considered her ability equal to that of Hannah More or Fanny Burney.

In 1753 there appeared *Shakespeare Illustrated* in two duodecimo volumes, 17½ cm., whose title-page reads: "Shakespeare Illustrated: or the Novels and Histories, on which the plays of Shakespear are founded, collected and translated from the original authors, with critical remarks. In two volumes. By the author of the Female Quixote, London: Printed for A. Millar in the *Strand*, 1753."

In 1754 appeared a third volume, evidently as an afterthought. Allibone, on Boswell's authority, asserts that the dedication was written by Johnson and that Malone attributes some of the observations to the same hand.

Mrs. Lennox's claim of being the first in this field is true only in so far as it refers to any extended, systematic attempt to translate or recapitulate the original stories and histories whence Shakespeare drew his plots. For Gerard Langbaine in his *Account of the English Dramatick Poets*, published in Oxford, 1691, pp. 455–467, had mentioned the

source of every one of the twenty-two plays treated by Mrs. Lennox, except that of *Hamlet* (altho he refers the curious reader to *Saxo-Grammaticus* and other historians), *Twelfth Night*, and *Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

For an elaborate setting forth of the argument or fable of the play, the model had been already given by Charles Gildon in his "*Works of Mr. William Shakespear*, vol. 7 (?) London: 1710." But no one up to 1753 had translated the various sources and compared them carefully with the dramas themselves.

As befits a warm friend of Dr. Johnson, her standard of criticism accords with that of the eighteenth century. To her the most valuable power of a poet is invention, and the highest degree of invention is that which is able to produce a series of events (*Dedication*, p. iv). Just here, in her eyes, is Shakespeare's weakness. Yet she rather inconsistently says,—“the truth is, that a very small Part of the Reputation of this mighty Genius depends upon the naked Plot . . . his chief Skill was in Human Actions, Passions, and Habits (vol. 1, pp. viii f.). It is difficult, however, as someone has remarked with reference to Dr. Johnson, to reconcile such statements with the vituperative comments that follow. She censures *the lack of unity of action*: “Thus has Shakespeare, undesignedly, no doubt, given us two Heroes instead of one in this Play;” . . . it “might have been as well called the *Tragedy of Laertes* as *Hamlet*” (vol. 2, p. 272); *the lack of unity of time*: “There are several of Shakespear's historical Plays which take in a greater Compass of Time than this, but none in which the absurdity of crowding the Events of many Years into a Representation of three Hours, is made so glaring” (*Richard III*, vol. 3, p. 166); “Absurdities like these are such a gross Abuse of the Understanding, that all the Beauties we find scattered throughout this Play, can hardly attone for them” (*ibid.*,

p. 169); *the lack of a moral: Measure for Measure* (vol. 1, p. 27); *the want of poetic justice*: "Shakespear has with Reason been censured for the Catastrophe of this Tragedy. The brave, the injured Hamlet falls with the Murderers he punishes" (vol. 2, pp. 270 f.), "Her [Cressida] not being punished is indeed an unpardonable Fault, and brings the greatest Imputation imaginable upon Shakespear's Judgment, who could introduce so vicious a Person in a Tragedy, and leave her without the due Reward of her Crimes" (vol. 3, p. 93). Even the characters are not spared: "Achilles, indeed, is a Character of his [Shakespeare's] own invention, ridiculous and inconstant to the last Degree, Brave, and a Coward; a Fool, yet a deep and accurate Reasoner" (*Troilus and Cressida*, vol. 3, p. 98). If Shakespeare changes, or adds to, the original it is for the worse: "Shakespear, by changing the Persons, altering some of the Circumstances, and inventing others, has made the whole an improbable Contrivance, borrowed just enough to shew his Poverty of Invention, and added enough to prove his want of Judgment" (*Much Ado About Nothing*, vol. 3, p. 261).

In the midst of this deluge of unfavorable criticism are found, here and there, a few bits of praise, principally for the historical pieces: "This Character [Holingshed's *Richard III*] is the very same with that drawn of him by Shakespear; but the latter is made more striking by the wonderful Propriety of the Manners and Sentiments he everywhere, throughout the Play, attributes to him" (*Richard III*, vol. 3, p. 165); "Shakespear improves this [Richard's death] into the following noble Description" (*ibid.*, p. 165). And, finally, in the true spirit of eighteenth century criticism she exclaims: "'Shakespear, Fancy's sweetest Child, Warbles his native Wood-Notes wild.' His true Praise seems to be summ'd up in those two Lines; for wild, though harmonious, his Strains certainly are". . . . he "seems

wholly a Stranger to the Laws of dramatic Poetry" (*Twelfth Night*, vol. I, p. 241).

Mrs. Lennox lacks breadth of view, she keeps too near her subject and becomes entangled with details, a fault which might be attributed to her sex, if it had not been shared equally with Johnson and his cult. Still, in her generation she exerted a wide influence that penetrated even into Germany. In *The Gentleman's Magazine* for May, 1754, pp. 233 f., a letter addressed to the Editor appeared, which well illustrates the effect of her publication: "Mr. Urban. Of all the criticisms upon Shakespear, that of a lady in a late work, intituled, Shakespear illustrated, is the most bold and comprehensive; she has not only remarked inaccurate expressions, mixed metaphors, broken scenes, or violated unities, but has attacked those powers for which his negligence has been overlooked, his invention, and his judgment; she has displayed the poverty of his invention, by shewing what he has borrowed, and the weakness of his judgment, by distinguishing the defects and incongruity of what he has added and changed. It has been generally taken for granted, that Shakespear improved every story which he made the foundation of a play, except where he was restrained by his regard to historical truth; but it will appear from this work, that he has degraded Italian novels by distorting natural characters, and substituting whimsical improbabilities, for natural events. I should, indeed, greatly rejoice to see my favourite author defended against this formidable Thalestris." Then follows an illustration, drawn from Mrs. Lennox's *Observations on Much Ado about nothing*, showing how Shakespeare "mangled the story of Ariosto" and then "pieced it with equal awkwardness and haste." "These, Mr. Urban, among many others in the same play, are brought as instances, that Shakespear has not deserved the veneration that has been paid to him. If he can be

defended, I hope some of your correspondents will attempt his defence, for which I confess myself to be unqualified. Yours, &c. T. B. Cambridge." (Pp. 233 f.)

Dunlop in his *History of Fiction* calls her "an acute and elegant critic" (3d ed., 1845, p. 216), and Macaulay in the *Edinburgh Review*, Oct., 1838, speaks in her praise. But with other critics she has not fared so well: Francis Douce in his *Illustrations of Shakespeare* (London, 1807, vol. 2, pp. 104 f.), says in notes on *Cymbeline*: "This speech has exercised the talents of a certain ingenious female *illustrator* of Shakespeare, who has endeavoured to ridicule the character of Imogen, and indeed the whole of the play. She degrades our heroine into a mere kitchen wench, and adverts to what she calls her *oeconomical education*. Now what is this but to expose her own ignorance of ancient manners? If she had missed the advantage of qualifying herself as a commentator on Shakespeare's plots by a perusal of our old romances, she ought at least to have remembered, what every well informed woman of the present age is acquainted with, the education of the princesses in Homer's *Odyssey*. It is idle to attempt to judge of ancient simplicity by a mere knowledge of modern manners; and such fastidious critics had better close the book of Shakespeare for ever. In another part of her critique on this play, she condemns the giving of the drug to Imogen which Pisanio had received from the queen, from an idea that he was sufficiently warned of its soporific quality; and she positively states that the physician had, by a whisper, informed Pisanio of its property; not one word of which is to be found in Shakespeare. So much for the criticism and accuracy of a work to which Dr. Johnson condescended to write a dedication."

She fares still worse at the hands of Knight in his *Pictorial Shakespeare*, 1839-42 (vol. 5, p. 183), *Introductory Notice to Cymbeline*: "Mrs. Lennox has given, in her 'Shak-

speared Illustrated,' a paraphrase of Boccaccio's story; which she has mixed up with more irreverent impertinence towards Shakspeare than can be perhaps found elsewhere in the English language, except in Dr. Johnson's judgment upon this play, which sounds very much like 'prisoner at the bar.' It might have been supposed that the odour of Mrs. Lennox's criticisms upon Shakspeare had been dissipated long before the close of the last century; but, nevertheless, Mr. Dunlop, in his 'History of Fiction,' published in 1816, makes the opinions of Mrs. Lennox his own."

Verplanck speaks of her as "our unfortunate townswoman" (vol. 3, p. 10), and Hudson in vol. 2, p. 139, of his *Edition of Shakspeare*, 1851, says her "choice dropping of criticism, like many others vouchsafed by her learned ladyship, is too wise, if not too womanly to need any comment from us, save that the Poet can better afford to have such things said, than the sayer can to have them repeated."

Meanwhile, however, on American soil, Puritan and Cavalier had, in their struggle to win a livelihood from the unbroken earth, other things to do than busy themselves with literary pursuits. The theologians were scholars, to be sure, but they loved not the playwright, Shakespeare, who had written for the theatre, that instrument of the devil.

The first allusion to the theatre, according to Clapp in *A Record of the Boston Stage*, 1853 (pp. i f.), "is made by Increase Mather in 1686. In his 'Testimony against profane and superstitious customs,' he says: 'There is much discourse now of beginning Stage Plays in New England.' " But plays did not begin to be performed in the colonies until 1732, and then in New York City (*A History of the New York Stage*, by Thomas Allston Brown, New York, 1903, vol. 1, p. viii). *Shakspeare* is first announced on March 5, 1750, when Thomas Kean and Murray appeared

in the First Nassau Street Theatre, in New York City, in *Richard III*, and continued to perform twice each week for five months (*ibid.*, pp. 2 f.). In Boston, where the opposition was so great that in 1750 the General Court of Massachusetts passed an act against Stage-Plays and other Theatrical Entertainments, no kind of theatre was opened until August 10, 1792, and then under the name of the "New Exhibition Room" where, among other things, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Hamlet* were performed as "moral lectures" (*Record of Boston Stage*, p. 8).

Legal proceedings were instituted by the horrified Puritans and arrests followed, but, in spite of all prosecution, a Boston theatre opened on the third of February, 1794, where Shakespeare, for better or for worse, was presented. Shakespeare on the American stage, however, is reserved for a future article, and only one fact more concerns us with reference to this playhouse, namely, that to the Boston theatre we owe the publication of the first plays of Shakespeare in the United States of America: "*Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*: a tragedy. In five acts. By William Shakespeare. As performed at the Theatre in Boston, and *Twelfth Night*; or, *What you will*: a comedy. In five acts. Written by William Shakespeare. As performed at the Theatre in Boston. With notes critical and illustrative. Both, Boston: Printed for David West, No. 36, Marlborough Street, and John West, No. 75, Cornhill." [1794] 16°, 16¾ cm.

The *Hamlet* has no annotation, but *Twelfth Night* has a few glossarial footnotes and stage directions. The text in both is much abridged. Doubtless Mr. Charles Stuart Powell, the manager of the Boston Theatre, and one of its leading actors, was responsible for these editions and comments.

The first American edition of Shakespeare's complete works was printed in Philadelphia in 1795-'96. The title-

page reads: "The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare. Corrected from the latest and best London editions, with notes, by Samuel Johnson, LL. D., to which are added, a Glossary and the Life of the author. Embellished with a striking likeness from the collection of His Grace the Duke of Chandos. First American Edition. Philadelphia: Printed and sold by Bioren & Madan. 1795." 8 vols. 12°, 17½ cm.

The text of the plays is printed from Johnson and Steevens, corrected by Reed 1785. In order to ascertain whether any editorial work was done, the writer selected *Richard III*, as being one of the most corrupt, and collated it with that of the 1785 edition. Many changes in punctuation were found, a dozen or more changes of words, besides not a few misprints. There are also numerous changes in orthography. Steevens stated (vol. VII, p. 149) that in the text of *Richard III* he followed the folio. The American editor, on the contrary, often prefers the quarto readings. His emendations, on the whole, seem to be due to an effort to modernize the text. Who the American editor was is not known, perhaps Bioren and Madan themselves, as they give one to understand from the Preface. That some one, consciously, did make changes in the text seems evident.

The preface contains a criticism of Shakespeare, doubly interesting as being the first printed in America. It deals with the morality of his plays and defends them at some length against their Puritan enemies: Altho other playwrights of his day were highly immoral and produced works of the utmost depravity, Shakespeare "on this head has nothing to fear" (p. v); "as a moral writer he was infinitely superior to any one of them, and . . . the reproaches which have been thundered from the pulpit against the stage, cannot reasonably be applied to the stage of Shakspeare" (p. vii). "For the inequality of composition in this poet,

a satisfactory apology may be made : ” “ Shakspeare never supervised an edition of his own plays and their imperfections have arisen in the process of transmission to us ” (pp. viii f.). Annotation is brushed away with a sentence : “ An American reader is seldom disposed to wander through the wilderness of verbal criticism, ” hence “ The present edition contains no notes of any kind, except one by Dr. Johnson at the end of each play ” (p. x).¹ The preface closes with a quotation from Dr. Blair, which altho written about Ossian, the editors think applies “ with equal justice to Shakspeare : ” “ Uncouth and abrupt, Shakspeare may sometimes appear,—But he is sublime, he is pathetic, in an eminent degree. . . . Of art too, he is [far] from being destitute, and his imagination is remarkable for delicacy as well as strength ” (p. xi).

Some judicial criticism is shown in the printing of the Poems, taken, according to the publishers, from Malone’s text of 1790 : “ Candour compelled us to receive two Poems not to be found in Mr. Malone’s Edition, but which have appeared in all the Copies since 1640. As they have not been by any Editor attributed to another hand, and seem only to have been rejected by Mr. Malone on account of their first appearing in a post-humous publication ; we have not deemed that sufficient reason for considering them spurious, and have given them a place at the conclusion of the work ” (vol. VIII, p. iv). These two poems, “ Come live with me and be my dear, ” and “ Why should this a desert be, ” follow the sonnets without title as if forming one continuous poem with them. The numbering of the sonnets is omitted, many changes in punctuation (Amer. ed., vol. 8, p. 117 : “ Alas ! ” —Malone’s, 1790, vol. x, p. 332 : “ Alas, ” etc.) and a few other evidences of editorial work appear :

¹ One end-note to the *Comedy of Errors* (vol. I, pp. 383 f.) is by Steevens.

e. g., vol. 8, p. 117 : *Passionate Pilgrim*, "lordling's,"—Malone, vol. x, p. 332 : "lording's."¹

The conclusion, therefore, to be drawn from the above investigation is that, contrary to the opinion hitherto held, the first American edition of Shakespeare 1795–96, gives evidence of some slight textual, philosophical, and judicial criticism.

Boston, not to be outdone by Philadelphia, seven years later brought out "The Dramatick Works of William Shakespeare. Printed complete, with Dr. Samuel Johnson's preface and notes. To which is prefixed the life of the author. Boston : Printed by Munroe & Francis," 1802–4. 8 v. Portrait, 12°, 17½ cm. Vol. 1 is dated 1802 ; vols. 2–6, 1803 ; 7, 8, 1804. The Barton Catalog, No. 40, says it is "The first edition published in Boston. It passed through three editions. In a copy of the third edition, formerly belonging to his son, C. S. Francis, and now in the Lenox library, is the following memorandum of D. Francis, the publisher : 'In 1802 Munroe and Francis issued proposals for publishing an edition of Shakspeare in serial numbers, two to a vol. at 50 cts. per no.—16 numbers [about 3000 copies]. Two editions were printed of the above. A third edition was demanded, and we added the *Poems*, making 18 nos. These editions were all printed from types ; of course *reset* every edition, as stereotype was not then known. The presswork was mostly done by Munroe and Francis personally, on a hand press with inking balls of sheep skin, the ink distributed by the hand. . . . Paper demy-size (19 x 20) costing 5 dolls. a ream ; made by hand. Ink and type imported, none worth using being made here.' The title-pages of this edition, which is evidently a copy of the

¹This is contrary to the Cambridge editors' statement that *lordling's* appears first in an edition of 1806 : Cambridge ed., 1892, vol. ix, p. 404.

Edinburgh edition, published in 1792, have vignette portraits and each play is separately paged.”¹

The same Catalog adds: “The editing was probably done by one of the printers, David Francis, ‘all his life a lover and careful reader of Shakespeare.’” But William Warland Clapp, Jr., in his *Record of the Boston Stage*, 1853, p. 78, asserts: “The notes were rewritten and condensed by Mr. Munroe from an English edition, and subsequently adopted by several publishers.” And, he continues, “The publishers, we are happy to say, were repaid for their arduous labors, and the firm was only dissolved in 1853, by the death of David Francis, which occurred on the 20th of March. He died respected by the residents of a city whose early literature he was instrumental in forming.” This contemporary testimony from a resident of Boston, himself an editor, and one who doubtless was personally acquainted with both Munroe and Francis, has far more weight than the guess, in 1880, of even so reliable a man as James Mascarene Hubbard. Hence it is safe to assume that Mr. Munroe is the American editor of the first Boston edition. Mr. Munroe differs from the Philadelphia editor of 1795 in that he introduces *Observations* at the beginning of each play and a fair sprinkling of footnotes, mainly explanatory and judicial, all selected from preceding editors and commentators, especially Johnson, Steevens, Warburton, Theobald, and Pope, and each carefully assigned to its respective author; for Mr. Munroe’s work was honest, if not original. The sources of the plays are dwelt upon in the introductions. The other comments are culled seemingly with a desire to bestow as much praise and as little blame as possible. Mrs. Lennox and the eighteenth century are

¹The writer has been unable to secure the said 1792 edition and hence cannot verify the above statement.

fading away, the dawn of the new era glimmers, tho faintly.

A second edition was published in 1807 in Boston by the same publishers with the addition of a ninth volume, altho above it was said the ninth volume was printed for the *third* edition. There are no notes nor observations on the poems. Each sonnet and poem has its arrangement and title as in the edition of 1640, except two: "Take, O! take those lips away" and "Let the bird of lowest lay," which, in the edition of 1640 and all others that the writer has been able to consult, have no heading, here are called *Stanzas* and *The Phoenix and the Turtle*.

A third edition soon after appeared:¹ "The works of William Shakespeare. In 9 v. With the corrections and illustrations of Johnson, Steevens, and others, revised by I. Reed. 3d Boston, from the 5th London edition. Boston: Munroe, Francis and Parker. 1810-12. Portrait. Illustrated. 12°. Contents 1-8. Same as in the first edition. 9. Pericles; Illustrations and notes; Poems." According to Barton, Cat. 49, "Each play is illustrated by a wood-cut engraved by Alexander Anderson, the first person in America who followed wood-engraving as a profession." This is the first illustrated edition of Shakespeare in America. The publishers aim at nothing but accuracy in reprinting Reed's edition, obtained from "William S. Shaw, esq. of this town, who loaned us the copy, when none was to be purchased," and "Though many errors doubtless have passed, we believe they are confined to literals, and venture to say that few, if any, *whole* words vary from the text we followed, which is Dr. Reed's third and last edition, in 21 vols. 8vo." 1803. (vol. ix, p. 74.)

In 1805-9, in Philadelphia, were issued: "The Plays of

¹ An asterisk denotes that the writer has not seen the edition.

William Shakspeare. In seventeen volumes. With the corrections and illustrations of various commentators. To which are added, notes, by Samuel Johnson and George Steevens. Revised and augmented by Isaac Reed, esq. with a glossarial index. C. and A. Conrad & Co. Philadelphia, 1809." No portrait, 12mo, 18½ cm. Vols. 2-6, Published by H. Maxwell and T. S. Manning, 1805; 7, 8, *ibid.*, 1806; 9, 10, J. Morgan and T. S. Manning, 1807; *ibid.*, 1808; 12, 16, *ibid.*, 1809; 13-15, 17, and 1, C. and A. Conrad & Co., 1809. This edition is printed from Reed's *Variorum*, 1803, with some changes. According to Verplanck (Barton Cat. 48) the American editor was Mr. Joseph Dennie (1768-1812), one of the leading scholars of his day, in fact the only one for a time who made literature a profession. Born in Boston, graduated from Harvard in 1790, an unsuccessful lawyer, then editor and author in Boston, in 1799 he removed to Philadelphia to accept a clerkship under Mr. Pickering, Secretary of State. Here he remained until his death. Allibone calls him the American Addison and speaks of the "melodious cadence" and "liquid flow" of his sentences.

In order to ascertain what, if any, editorial work was done with the text, *Richard III* has been collated with Reed's 1803. There are many variations in punctuation, those of any importance agreeing with Ayscough's edition, Dublin, 1791. There are also many differences in orthography and contractions of proper names, and a few changes in words, likewise as in Ayscough. A few, altho some of them are not without precedent, are probably typographical errors. Dennie claims but one independent emendation: Act IV, Sc. 4, p. 153: "*Two* deep and dead." In a footnote he says: "I have restored the true reading. . . . The eye of the compositor must have been led astray, by the

frequent repetition of the word *too*, and the ear of the proof-reader could not detect the error. Mr. Ayscough's edition, which deservedly ranks with the most correct, countenances the reading which I have taken the liberty to adopt. *Am. Ed.*" From this collation it seems that Dennie followed, in the main, the text of Reed's variorum, 1803, but made several changes after Ayscough.

Dennie offers some conjectures of his own, both good and bad, and does not hesitate to express his opinion vigorously on the merits of others' suggestions, as in vol. 10, *Henry VI*, part I, Act III, Sc. 1, p. 60, note 9—"the *protector*:" "I have added the article—*the*, for the sake of metre. *Steevens*.' Mr. Steevens is extremely fond of restoring, adding and supplying words for the sake of the *metre*, and very frequently does so to the great injury of our author. This is one of the numerous instances in which his interpolations are unpardonable. He has here sacrificed to his love of metre the strength and boldness of the interrogation.—The emphasis ought certainly to rest on 'Protector,' but Mr. Steevens's amendment has placed it on the article '*the*.' *Am. Ed.*" In vol. 3, *Twelfth Night*, Act II, Sc. 3, p. 209, Dennie makes the following attempt to emend a perfectly lucid line: "The meaning of our author undoubtedly is 'Come and kiss me, sweet and young.' I think it highly probable, that this line has undergone some alteration, which renders it so obscure as not to be understood by any of the Commentators. In place of 'Then come kiss me, *sweet and twenty*,' I would read 'Then come kiss, *sweet one-and-twenty*.' Come, enjoy pleasure while blest with the charms and vigour of youth. *Am. Ed.*" In vol. 11, *Henry VIII*, Act I, Sc. 3, p. 227, he says: "I am satisfied the text is erroneous; Shakspeare must have known, that the *spavin* and *springhalt* were distinct diseases. . . . In place of the alteration made

by Mr. Pope I would prefer to read, 'the spavin, *or*¹ springhalt reign'd among them.' *Am. Ed.*"

Reed's variorum of twenty-one volumes, 1803, is so loaded with notes that they often far over-balance the text. Dennie retains the majority of these notes verbatim, also the introductions and lengthy end remarks, and even that false statement of Steevens: "This Account of the Life of Shakspeare is printed from Mr. Rowe's second edition, in which it had been abridged and altered by himself after its appearance in 1709."² Occasionally the notes are abridged, and then the signature is apt to be forgotten. Otherwise every note is carefully accredited to its rightful owner. The American editor has also added many comments of his own, glossarial and illustrative. The original notes are always marked with an asterisk or dagger and signed *Am. Ed.*, the others are numbered. The writer has read every note and finds only one Americanism, that line of comment carried to such an extent, later, by Verplanck: vol. 12, *Troilus and Cressida*, Act III, Sc. 2, p. 105, "as plantage to the moon." "This opinion governs the practice of the generality of the farmers, in the neighborhood of Philadelphia, especially those of German descent, at the present day. *Am. Ed.*"

There is no original annotation on sixteen of the plays: *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Measure for Measure*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Winter's Tale*, *Comedy of Errors*, *Mac-*

¹ The Cambridge editors wrongly assign this emendation to Verplanck (Collier's conjecture), vol. v, p. 629, l. 13.

Verplanck, 1847 edition, vol. i, *Henry VIII*, p. 17: "the spavin *And* springhalt" and in the notes, p. 54 f., Verplanck discourses at length on the subject, favoring the reading of *And*.

² The truth is "This Account of the Life" is exactly the same in both editions of Rowe, 1709 and 1714. The abridgment and alteration were made by Pope and first appeared in vol. i, pp. xxv-xli, of his edition of 1725.

beth, *King John*, *Richard II*, *Henry IV* (parts 1, 2), *Hamlet*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Pericles*. The editor has commented most voluminously on *Troilus and Cressida*, *Richard III*, and *Henry V*.

It is interesting to observe the difference between the two Philadelphia editions. In 1795 we are informed that the American public cares nothing for annotation ; in 1805-9 the text is almost lost under the mass of comment. Nor had any previous edition in America shown so much editorial work, both in text and annotation. Many of the emendations and suggestions are unnecessary, to be sure, some are poor. In the notes, Mr. Dennie,—and we have no doubt it was Mr. Dennie, for what other scholar handled the pen in Addisonian style in Philadelphia or in any other city of the United States from 1805-9?—in the notes, Mr. Dennie has shown himself an independent, sensible thinker and a clear and graceful writer, who, however, never ventured beyond the field of verbal criticism.

In Boston, in 1813, next appeared two editions of Shakespeare, one in six volumes, the other complete in one volume, both printed by the same workmen and from the same type : 1. "The Plays of William Shakspeare. In six volumes. Printed from the text of Isaac Reed, Esq. Boston : Published by Charles Williams ; and by Joseph Delaplaine, Philadelphia. J. T. Buckingham, Printer, 1813." Portrait, the Felton, engraved by J. Boyd. 24mo, 13½ cm. Each volume has an engraved title-page with a vignette and "Published by Charles Williams. Boston & Joseph Delaplaine Philadelphia, 1813" (see Barton Cat., 52).—2. "The Plays of William Shakspeare. Complete in one volume. Accurately printed from the text of Isaac Reed, Esq. Boston : Published by Charles Williams ; and by Joseph Delaplaine, Philadelphia. Joseph T. Buckingham, Printer, 1813." 8vo, 22½ cm. The engraved title-page has "Published by Charles Wil-

liams, Boston & Eastburn, Kirk & Co. New York, 1813." The printer's postscript is dated February, 1814. Both editions are entirely without introductions or annotation of any kind. They claim to be accurately printed from Reed's text, but a collation of *Richard III*, alone, brings to light over one hundred and seventy-five deviations in punctuation, orthography, contractions, etc., not counting repetitions of any one change. Only one variation in words has been observed: Williams' ed., Act IV, Sc. 1, p. 548, "on *my* peril;"—Reed's 1803, vol. XIV, p. 427, "on *thy* peril." If this be accurate printing, one might well ask what would the contrary be!

Not until 1817–18 were Shakespeare's plays published in New York: * "The Dramatic Works of William Shakespeare Revised by I. Reed, Esq. New York: H. Durell 10 vols. 8vo. 1817–18." A copy of this edition is in the Birmingham Shakespeare Memorial Library.

Again in New York in 1821 appeared:¹ "The dramatic works of William Shakespeare in 10 v. With the corrections and illustrations of Johnson, Steevens, and others. Revised by I. Reed, New York: Collins and Hannay, 1821." 12mo, 19½ cm. Each volume is embellished with a steel engraving by P. Maverick, Durand, etc. Is this another issue of the 1817–18 edition? A second edition of the same was published in 1823, another in 1824, and again in 1826, 12mo, 18½ cm., all by Collins & Hannay, New York.² Is this edition a copy of the third Boston edition, 1810–12? At least volume ten of the 1823 edition is an exact reprint of volume IX, 1812, which is the only one of the latter edition that has been seen by the writer. It is copied word for word, note for note, even to the Addenda,

¹ The writer has seen only vols. 8 and 9 of this edition.

² The writer has seen the 1823 and 1826 editions, not that of 1824.

except that volume x omits the poems of the 1812 volume. The footnotes of the other volumes, fortunately comparatively few, were selected and abridged from Reed's variorum, 1803, and are assigned, as a rule, to their rightful owners. The *Observations* preceding each play are usually copied verbatim from the same source. However, about one-fourth of them show a process of selection from both the introductory and end notes. There is no original annotation. A collation of the text of *Richard III*, 1823 ed., with that of Reed's variorum, 1803, from which it is eventually taken, shows in punctuation, capitalization, orthography, etc., more than 180 variations, on the whole unimportant. Characteristic of the 1823 and 1826 editions is the contraction of *the* with the following word. The differences in words are very few, and these may be set down to careless proof-reading and the printer's charge. Certainly there was no editorial work worthy of the name.

In 1835 Dearborn published in New York: "The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare, with the corrections and illustrations of Dr. Johnson, G. Steevens, and others. Revised by Isaac Reed, Esq. In six volumes. New York: George Dearborn, Publisher, 1835," 8vo, 20½ cm. It is the 1821 edition of Collins & Hannay of New York, printed in six volumes insted of ten, with the contents exactly the same: I. The *Author's Life* by Rowe; Dr. Johnson's *Preface*; Farmer's *Essay on the Learning of Shakespeare*; the plays in the order of the 1821 edition and addenda. Only the steel engravings of the 1821, '23, '24 and '26 editions have been omitted. The observations prefixed to each play, the occasional end-notes, the selected footnotes are reproduced verbatim from the same edition. In truth, it is so exactly copied that the editor is misled into making false statements: 1835 edition, vol. 6, pages 346, 378, 380, 425, etc., refer to "Illustrations, vol. x." But there is no volume ten. How-

ever, in four places the number has been properly corrected to read "Vol. 6," pages 451, 499, etc. The text of *Richard III* follows the 1821, 1823 model even to its mistakes.

Here is found, then, no editorial work, nor is there any, probably, in the following : * "The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare Harper's Fine Edition. Revised by I. Reed, Esq. New York 6 vols. 8vo, 1839," in the Birmingham Library, which must be only another edition of this 1821 Collins & Hannay edition. For Harper's Fine Edition,—“Numerous Steel Engravings. The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare, with the corrections and illustrations of Dr. Johnson, G. Steevens, and others. Revised by Isaac Reed, Esq., in six volumes. New York : Harper & Brothers, 1846,” 12mo, 19½ cm.,—doubtless the same as the above, is but a reprint of the 1835 Dearborn edition and hence indirectly of the 1821-'23 editions. In every deviation given above the 1846 edition corresponds to the 1821-'23 editions except that in a few insignificant differences in orthography and abbreviations it follows the 1835 edition. Even the inappropriate references to volume ten and the four corrections to “volume six” of the Dearborn edition are faithfully reproduced. The pagination in all these editions is the same as in the 1821 edition, and the 1846 edition has also the same numbering of leaves as the 1835 edition, so that a reference to one holds good for the other. Harper's 1846 issue has the outline illustrations by Harvey, Roetzsche, etc., taken from Harper's 1841 edition of Singer.

In 1823 was started in Philadelphia another long series of editions, still from Reed's variorum of 1803, but through the medium of a ten-volume edition of the same year : “The Plays of William Shakspeare, accurately printed from the text of the corrected copy left by the late George Steevens, Esq., with glossarial notes, and a sketch of the life of Shaks-

peare in eight volumes. Philadelphia: Published by M'Carty & Davis, 1830, being a second edition of that published in 1823." The engraved title-page reads, "Philadelphia. H. C. Carey & I. Lea & McCarty & Davis 1823." Plates, 32mo, 12 cm. In 1824 the same publishers brought out in Philadelphia the same text and notes in two volumes, 8vo, 20½ cm., illustrated with engravings by George B. Ellis from the designs of R. Smirk, R. A.

In 1825, King published in New York the same two-volume edition, minus the Ellis engravings: "The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare, from the text of Johnson, Stevens, and Reed; with glossarial notes, his life, and a Critique on his genius and writings, by Nicholas Rowe, Esq. New-York. Published by S. King, 1825. Portraits, engraved by Maria A. and Emily Maverick," 4°, 25 cm. According to the Birmingham Library catalog the same was again issued in 1828. Again in 1829, the same appeared under the auspices of the Harpers: "The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare, accurately printed from the text of the corrected copy left by the late George Steevens, Esq., with a Glossary, and notes, and a sketch of the Life of Shakspeare. In two volumes. New-York: Printed and published by J. & J. Harper, 1829. 8vo, 22 cm. Portraits. Also every play is illustrated by a wood-cut." There follow:—

The Dramatic Works of Shakspeare, from the text of Johnson and Steevens. In two volumes. Philadelphia: Printed for Thomas Wardle. 1831. 8vo, 20½ cm.

*The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare from the text of Steevens. Hartford, Ct.: Silas Andrus, 2 vols. 8vo. 1832. In the Birmingham Library and presumably the same as the above 1831 edition.

The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare, accurately printed from the text of the corrected copy left by the late George Steevens, Esq., with a glossary, and notes, and a sketch of the life of Shakspeare. In two volumes. Hartford, Ct.: Andrus and Judd, 1836." 8vo, 22½ cm. Plate medal.

* The Dramatic Works of Shakspeare from the text of Johnson and Steevens. Philadelphia : T. Wardle, 1 vol., duo, 1836. In the Birmingham Library, doubtless the 1831 Wardle edition in one volume instead of two.

* The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare, accurately printed from the text of the corrected copy left by the late George Stevens. With a glossary and notes, and a sketch of the life of the poet. With 40 illustrations. In 2 v. Boston : Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1850. 2 v. in 1. Portrait, the Chandos. 8°. Contents I, Life ; the 37 plays ; Glossary (Barton Catalog, 79). This is probably the same as the Harper 1829 issue.

* The Dramatic Works of Shakspeare. From the text of Johnson and Steevens. With a complete glossary. Complete in one volume. Illustrated. New York : Leavitt and Allen. 1852. XII, 1062 pp. 8°. Contains Life by Rowe (Barton Catalog, 84).

* The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare. With life, glossary, and poems, 42 illustrations on steel. In 8 v. Philadelphia : J. B. Smith and Co. (1855?) Portraits. 16°. There are neither introductions nor notes (Barton Catalog, 95). Does this edition belong to this series?

* The complete works of William Shakspeare, dramatic and poetic : the text from the corrected copy of the late G. Steevens. With glossarial notes, and a memoir, by A. Chalmers. 40 illustrations. Complete in one volume. New York : Miller, Orton and Milligan. 1856. 7—988 pp. Portrait, the Chandos. 8°. (Barton Catalog, 98.) Probably the Harper's 1829 edition.

These thirteen, possibly fourteen, editions are treated together, because a collation of the text of *Richard III* and of the entire body of notes proves that they have a common source: "The Plays of William Shakspeare, Accurately printed from the text of the corrected copy left by the late George Steevens, Esq., with glossarial notes. In ten volumes. London : Printed for J. Johnson, etc. 1803." 16mo, 16 cm. The advertisement to this edition says the text is carefully printed from that of Reed's twenty-one volume variorum and the notes are by *W. H.*, whoever he may be. The collation proves that these editions were not all copied directly from Reed's ten-volumes (of course those editions not seen by the writer must be omitted from this discussion). The Philadelphia text of 1824 and 1830 is reprinted from that of 1823, for its every variation is reproduced. The New York 1829 issue is copied from the 1824 edition, for it has

not only the same differences, but also a few changes in the notes found only in the 1824 volumes. The Hartford edition of 1836 is an exact reprint of the 1829 edition, following even its pagination, omitting only the illustrations. The 1824, 1829, and 1836 editions contain the typographical errors in the notes of the 1823, 1830 edition. The 1825 and the 1831 editions, however, share in none of these variations; but in every case follow the source, each having been taken directly from the Reed's 1803 edition. Neither does the one evidence any dependence upon the other, the 1825 edition being carelessly printed and abounding in typographical errors. Shakespeare's *Life* in the Philadelphia 1823, 1830 edition is a short sketch, abridged and condensed from Chalmers' *Life*, prefixed to Chalmers' variorum of 1805. The 1824, 1829, 1830, and 1836 editions reprint the same. Instead, the 1825 and 1831 copies have Rowe's *Life*, as in the 1803 edition. All have retained the short notes of Johnson and Steevens at the end of each play and the glossarial footnotes of *W. H.* as found in Reed's ten-volume edition 1803,—all, that is to say, except the 1825 edition, which omits every end-note, and the 1831 edition, which, seemingly for lack of space, omits the end-notes from *Merchant of Venice*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *Macbeth*, *Richard II*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Titus Andronicus*, and *Collins' Song*, after *Cymbeline*. In a very few instances, only, has the 1823 edition omitted an unimportant footnote, wherein it is sure to be followed by the 1824, 1829, 1830, and 1836 editions. Very rarely there occurs an abridgment or a correction. The careless proof-reading of the 1825 edition is obvious, also, in the notes. Only in the 1825 edition are any new notes inserted, and these are valueless.

The 1829 and 1836 editions have also appended a glossary, and all have followed the 1803 ten-volume edition in placing the numbers of the acts and scenes at the top of each page,

an admirable time-saving aid for reference, first found in Blair's Edinburgh edition of 1769. The number of the act had often before headed the page (even the first American edition of 1795 has that), but to the McCarty and Davis edition of Philadelphia 1823 is due the credit of introducing into America the printing of the number of the scene at the top of the page.

Finally, to recapitulate, it may be said these thirteen or fourteen editions have a common source, Reed's ten-volume 1803 edition, and fall into groups, the 1824, 1829, 1830, and 1836 issues depending upon the 1823 edition, the 1825 and 1831, separately, upon Reed's. And in none is there any editorial work, beyond a slight effort to rectify errors in the notes.

Up to 1831 only the Reed's Johnson and Steevens text had been printed in America. But in this year an innovation was made, and New York started another long series from Singer's text: * "*The Dramatic Works and Poems of William Shakspeare with Notes by S. W. Singer and Life by C. Symmons, (New York). 2 vols. 8vo, 1831.*" And again in 1834: * "*The Dramatic Works and Poems of William Shakspeare with Notes, etc., by S. W. Singer, and Life by C. Symmons. New York: G. Dearborn. 2 vols. 8vo, 1834.*"

The above are both in the Birmingham Library. In 1835 James Conner brought out a one-volume edition: "*The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare. From the text of the corrected copies of Steevens and Malone, with a life of the poet, by Charles Symmons, D. D. The seven ages of man; embellished with elegant engravings. And a glossary. Complete in one volume. New-York: Published by James Conner. 1835.*" 16mo, 17 cm., xx; 844 pp. Plate of medal. Contents: Life by Symmons [abridged from that in Chiswick ed.]; commendatory verses; *Preface*

of the players; *Seven Ages of Man* (with wood-cuts); the plays in the same order as the Chiswick edition. Glossary. All annotation and preliminary remarks are omitted and the print is objectionably small. The Birmingham Library has also: * "*The Dramatic Works and Poems of William Shakespeare* with Notes by S. W. Singer and Life by C. Symmons. New York: Harper & Brothers. 2 vols. 8vo, 1837," and the same dated * 1839.

What is probably the same was published again in 1841: *The Dramatic Works and Poems of William Shakspeare*, with notes, original and selected, and introductory remarks to each play, by Samuel Weller Singer, F. S. A., and a life of the poet, by Charles Symmons, D. D. In two volumes. New-York: Published by Harper & Brothers, 1841," 8vo, 24½ cm. This is a reprint, with a few changes, of the Chiswick edition of 1826. *The Seven Ages* are omitted, the *Preliminary Remarks* and end-notes are retained verbatim, but many of the footnotes are abridged. There are no original notes and there is no evidence of any textual criticism. There are nineteen illustrations in outline by Harvey, Retzsche, Northcote, etc., after the style of those in Valpy, 1832-34. The engraving to Hamlet and the engraved title-page in volume II bear the date 1837. In volume I are to be seen traces of an erased 1837 on the two engraved title-pages. The *Miscellaneous Poems* have been added: *Venus and Adonis*; *The Rape of Lucrece*; *Sonnets*; *A Lover's Complaint*; (all with scattering footnotes selected from Malone and Steevens); *The Passionate Pilgrim* (without notes). These poems have evidently been reprinted from Valpy's fifteen volume edition, 1832-34, judging by the order of stanzas in the *Passionate Pilgrim* and the peculiar manner of signature at the end, "Wm. Shake-speare," which are the same in both.

In 1843 Harper issued another edition of the same, but

in a misleading manner. It was published weekly at twenty-five cents a number and advertised on the first title-page as, "The only perfect edition. To be completed in eight numbers, with nineteen illustrations . . . etchings on steel." It is in every way, even to pagination, the same as the 1841 edition above described. The edition has one peculiarity: the weekly numbers are not complete in themselves but lack a few scenes or an act which is found in the next issue, as if to insure the sale of the following copies.

The Barton Catalog No. 74 reports a volume published in 1843 in Hartford, which is doubtless merely a reprint of Conner's 1835 edition: * "*The dramatic works of William Shakspeare*. From the text of the corrected copies of Steevens and Malone, with a life of the poet, by C. Symmons. The seven ages of man; embellished with elegant engravings. And a glossary. Hartford: W. Andrus. 1843. xx, 844 pp. Plate of medal. Sm. 12°, Contents. Life; Verses; Preface of the players; Seven ages of man (with wood-cuts); Plays." And the Birmingham Library records another dated 1846: * "*The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare with Life*, by C. Symmons (Hartford, [U. S.]): Andrus. I. vol. duo. 1846."

It is safe to infer, then, that in this series of nine editions, reprinted, more or less correctly, from the Chiswick of 1826, with its text founded upon Steevens and Malone and mutilated by Singer, there is no original editorial work.

Of this series, in so far as it is founded upon the same edition, and yet outside of it by virtue of its acknowledged editorial work, is an edition of 1836: "*The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare*; with a life of the poet, and notes, original and selected. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, and company. 1836. 7 vols. Illustrated. 8vo, 22 cm." "The accomplished scholar" mentioned in the Advertisement (vol. 1, p. 6), who prepared the work for the press anonymously,

was Oliver William Bourn Peabody (1799–1848), a Harvard graduate and successively lawyer, editor, professor, and Unitarian preacher. It was during his residence in Boston and while editing *The North American Review* in conjunction with his brother-in-law, Alexander H. Everett, that he made this his first venture into the editorial field. This edition, rather than Richard Grant White's of twenty years later, deserves to be called epoch-making, for the publishers claim to follow, in general, the readings of the folio of 1623. Up to this date, in America, editors had paid no attention to the original sources, but had been content to reprint Reed's Johnson-Steevens or Singer's Malone-Steevens "accurately" or with some changes by aspiring critics. That the text, on the whole, remains Singer's and that the original work is meager, in no wise impairs the fact that here, for the first time in America, is sounded the true note for a correct editing of the Shakespearian text.

The writer has not regarded it necessary to collate Peabody's text with that of Singer, but has accepted the former's own statement of the emendations made. The avowed textual emendations number scarcely two dozen in all; and eight, or about one-third of them, do *not* follow the folio, although they would better have done so. Throughout the text Peabody writes *ed*, instead of 'd, in the past participle, following the Magnet edition of 1834–35, the first to pursue this course. Of the few conjectural readings offered, no one is original, altho they are not assigned to any author. The *Preliminary Remarks* and the footnotes are taken from Singer, often abridged, occasionally condensed. Those not from Singer are nearly all from the Variorum of 1821 and, as a rule, without signature, so that a laborious collation is necessary to determine which comments are original. The writer performed this labor only to find Peabody's own notes comprise an exceedingly small number and deal almost

exclusively with textual criticism. In abridging, he studiously omits any derogatory personal criticism of other commentators. Such omissions are interesting as showing the upward tendency to a higher plane of criticism than that of personal vituperation which flourished in the eighteenth century. When he condenses,—and it is here that Peabody is at his best,—there is a great gain over Singer in clearness and directness: *e. g.*, vol. 2, p. 222, note 2, “This term was anciently synonymous with friend; cf. Singer, vol. 3, p. 66, “This word was anciently applied to those of the same sex who had an esteem for each other,” etc. The choice of notes seems arbitrary, for easy words are defined, difficult ones passed over and vice versa. Some typographical (?) errors are to be noted: vol. VII, p. 131, note 4. “The quarto reads *says*” when in fact the quarto reads *sees*.

Peabody's chief service as an editor lies in the line of textual criticism, and his merit therein consists not in what he did, so much as in what he aimed to do: restore original readings. Hence from this avowed policy with reference to the text, Peabody must be regarded as the father of textual criticism in America. According to the Barton Catalog, No. 68: “This edition was reprinted in 1837 and 1839 and frequently since without change save in date and publishers.” The Birmingham Library has * “*The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare*, Phillips and Sampson, Boston [U. S.], 7 vols. 8vo. 1848,” which is doubtless also a reprint of the 1836 edition. Another edition appeared in 1849: * “*The dramatic works of William Shakspeare*; with a life of the poet, and notes, original and selected. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, & Co. 1849. 7 v. Portrait 8°, with the same contents as the first edition of 1836” (Barton Catalog, 78).

The Birmingham Library reports a similar edition of 1849–51, but of eight volumes. What is probably the same came out in 1850–57, every play illustrated with a beautiful

steel engraving, and prefixed to volume VIII Mrs. Siddons as the tragic muse, from the painting by Sir Joshua Reynolds. The title-page of volumes I and II reads: "*The dramatic works of William Shakspeare*; illustrated: embracing a life of the poet, and notes, original and selected. Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company, 1850. 4°, 26 cm." The title pages of the other volumes omit the word *illustrated*. The third volume is dated 1854, the remainder 1857. The only difference in volumes I-VII from the edition of 1836 is in a slight variation in the *Advertisement*, which closes thus: "in its combination of accuracy and elegance, they [the publishers] flatter themselves this will be found to be the most splendid edition ever presented to the American public." Neither was this an empty boast, for up to that time no edition could compare with it in elegance. Volume VIII, "*The poetical works of William Shakspeare*; with notes illustrative and explanatory; together with a supplementary notice to the Roman plays. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and company. 1857," is copied almost verbatim from volume six of Knight's Pictorial edition of Shakspeare, London, 1841 [or 1838-43] without one word of acknowledgment.

How slavishly Knight is followed may be seen on p. 155, Note 1, "See *Cymbeline*, Illustrations of Act II," but in Peabody there are no *Illustrations* to which to refer. There is one emendation of the text: Peabody, vol. 8, p. 14, "Like a *di-dapper*," cf. Knight, vol. 6, *Venus and Adonis*, p. 10, "Like a *dive-dapper*;" and thereon Peabody makes his only original note in the entire volume (p. 14, 2): "This is generally printed *dive-dapper* without any authority." But Peabody is mistaken, for the edition of *Venus and Adonis* of 1630 (besides others) has *Dive-dapper*. About one-third of Knight's note on Sonnet CXXV, p. 86, is omitted, and some unimportant changes in punctuation are made, otherwise

Knight is exactly reprinted. This volume of poems 8°, 20½ cm., was reissued in the same year, the only difference being the substitution of the Chandos portrait engraved by McCarty for that of Mrs. Siddons as Tragic Muse.

Perhaps this edition was completed in 1854 and the volumes dated 1857 were later reprints therefrom, for the Barton Catalog 92 reports a complete set of eight volumes dated 1854: * "The dramatic works of William Shakspeare; with a life of the poet, and notes, original and selected. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and co. 1854. 8 v. Portrait, the Chandos. 8°. Contents, 1-7. Same as in the first edition [1836] 8. Poetical works. This edition seems to be printed from the plates used for the edition of 1836. A portrait has been inserted and the engravings in that edition have been omitted."

To which series a certain six-volume edition, published in 1838, belongs, the writer does not know, having as yet had no opportunity to examine it: * "*The dramatic works of Shakspeare*, Embellished with plates and vignettes. In 6 v. Philadelphia: T. T. Ash and H. F. Anners, 1838. Portrait, the Chandos. 32°. There are neither introductions nor notes. The plays are independently paged" (Barton Cat., No. 69).

Gulian Crommelin Verplanck (1786-1870) was the next American editor of Shakespeare. He was born in New York City, graduated from Columbia as the youngest of her alumni, was lawyer, professor, author, and, with William Cullen Bryant and Robert C. Sands, joint editor of the *Talisman*, from 1827, for three years. The title page of his edition reads: "*Shakespeare's Plays: with his life*. Illustrated with many hundred wood-cuts, executed by H. W. Hewet, after designs by Kenny Meadows, Harvey, and others. Edited by Gulian C. Verplanck, L. L. D., with critical introductions, notes, etc., original and selected. In

three volumes. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1847. Portraits. 4°, 27 cm." "The first number of the parts in which this edition was published, appeared in 1844, H. W. Hewet publisher and engraver of the wood-cuts. It is an imitation of Knight's Pictorial edition, the most of its illustrations being used, with others of an inferior quality. Some of the covers to the original numbers read 'The illustrations designed, selected and arranged by Rob. W. Weir.' The title was afterward changed to 'Harper's illuminated and illustrated Shakespeare'" (Barton Catalog, 76). The text is founded upon Collier, but with numerous changes made in agreement with the sound principle, advocated by Knight and Peabody, of adherence to the first folio. In a few instances only, has Verplanck deviated from this rule to follow Dyce's or others' suggestions, or his own judgment. In an original way, however, Verplanck seems to have done next to nothing. The only new reading offered is in *Troilus and Cressida*, vol. 3, Act V, Sc. 3 : "For we would give much, to so count violent thefts." And Richard Grant White, edition 1, vol. 2, p. 86, calls attention to the fact that Verplanck first restored the old word, "Cherubin," in Act I, Sc. 2, of the *Tempest*. Still, how many changes were made may be inferred from Verplanck's own statement in the Introductory Remarks to *Hamlet*, vol. 3, p. 9 : "He [Verplanck] has departed from Mr. Collier's text in more than twenty places, chiefly by restoring the old folio readings, where Mr. Collier has preferred those of the quartos."

The numerous notes, unsigned, are not placed at the foot of the page, as in former editions, but inconveniently collected at the end of each play. and, worse still, unnumbered. They were selected principally from the Variorum of 1821 and from Singer, 1826. Collier and Knight were also freely drawn upon and Verplanck has taken bodily nearly every thing, even to the illustrations, found in Knight's Pictorial

edition. Verplanck, however, has not been so slavish in his methods as Peabody, but has shown some independence, if not originality, and a clear and virile mind that breathes at times thro' the dreary wastes of European criticism like a fresh western wind. The several notes due to Verplanck deal generally with Americanisms and betray the lawyer. See notes on *Julius Caesar*, Act V, Sc. 1, vol. 3, p. 49: "Warn was the old word, both technical and colloquial, for *summon*, of which the English editors give various examples from old writers, as of an obsolete word. It is, however, in the United States, one of those words brought over by the generation next after Shakespeare's, which has preserved its ancient sense, especially in New England, there *town meetings*, jury-men, etc., . . . are still said to be 'legally warned.'" Also Notes on *Romeo and Juliet*, Act V, Sc. 2, vol. 3, p. 61: "They traveled in pairs, says Baretti, that one might be a check on the other; a shrewd piece of policy, which has been adopted by our American Shakers."

Imitating Knight, Verplanck has prefixed to each play voluminous *Introductory Remarks*, re-cast from those of preceding editors, containing besides "many of the more curious notices of costume, arms, architecture, etc., contributed to the English Pictorial edition by Mr. Planché, some brief critical notices of their several characteristics of style, versification, design, and of tone and colour of thought" (vol. I, p. ix) and a dissertation on the chronology of each, wherein the editor sets forth his views on the nature of Shakespeare's genius. He does not believe that it sprang, Minerva-like, into being fully developed, but that it grew and unfolded with time and cultivation. This opinion, in direct opposition to that held by Rowe and his followers, was not original with Verplanck, but first suggested by Johnson. In the *Introductory Remarks* to the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (vol. 2, p. 5), Verplanck says: "Johnson (probably on the

authority of his friend, Sir J. Reynolds) has well replied to the objection raised by Upton to Shakespeare's right of authorship to this piece [*Two Gentlemen of Verona*], founded on the difference of style and manner from his other plays, *by comparing this difference to the variation of manner between Raphael's first pictures and those of his ripened talent.*" Altho Pope, Dryden, and Malone, in common with Coleridge and the German school held to the same doctrine of growth, still Verplanck seems to believe in his own originality. He certainly did dwell upon the theory to a much greater extent than any of his predecessors. "As this part of the work," he says, "is that which has most interested the editor, and on which he has bestowed most study and thought, it is, of course, that part of his own contribution to Shakespearian Literature which he regards as of chief value" (vol. 1, p. x).

Hence it is not surprising to find Verplanck, in the endeavor to uphold his hobby, explaining away inequalities of style and other difficulties in a play by calling it a youthful production, revised in later years, and claiming that frequently the quartos contain the youthful efforts, the folios those bearing the refining touch of the master's hand. Thus *Henry V* grew from quartos to folio with thoro revision and large additions (*Henry V*, Int. Rem., vol. 1, p. 6). *Midsummer Night's Dream* (Int. Rem., vol. 2, p. 6), *Romeo and Juliet* (Int. Rem., vol. 3, p. 5), etc., were early productions, later revised and improved. A small volume could be filled with Verplanck's comments in support of this theory, but one more extract must suffice: "Its [*Richard III's*] diction and its versification are in a transition state between those of his earlier works and those of *Henry IV* and the *Merchant of Venice*. From these indications, I should not hesitate to pronounce that it was written soon after the two parts of the 'Contention' and before *Henry IV*, *King John*, or even the

first form of *Romeo and Juliet*. Thus we may here trace the varied, but nevertheless progressive development of the Poet's mind; the three parts of *Henry VI* successively rising each above the other, and preparing us for the higher dramatic excellence of *Richard III*, far superior to any of them, yet superior, chiefly, in the same class and kind; while *Richard III* again, in Clarence's dream and other scattered passages, shows the dawn of that poetic splendour, and the early gushings of that flood of thought, which was thenceforward to enrich all the Poet's dramatic conceptions" (*Rich. III*, Int. Rem., vol. 1, p. 6).

Following the folio, Verplanck preserves the general division of comedies, histories and tragedies; but, deviating from that authority, seeks to group the plays "according to the several progressive stages of their author's style, taste, and general cast of thought. In this way, the growth of the author's mind, the ripening of his taste, his formation of diction and of versification for himself, may all be made more prominent, so as to be perceptible even to the careless reader" (vol. 1, p. xiii).

As an editor Verplanck far surpasses Peabody. His edition, altho cumbersome in arrangement, (notes unnumbered and unsigned, collected at the end of the plays, plays separately paged, etc.), is based upon sound principles. The author classes himself with the subjective critics and avows that he is a transmitter of the "higher Shakespearian criticism in which this century has been so prolific" (vol. 1, p. ix), a disciple of Coleridge, Schlegel, Mrs. Jameson, Hallam, etc. His greatest merit in his own eyes is to have developed at length the doctrine of the gradual development of the wonderful mind of Shakespeare.

Verplanck's work was favorably regarded by his contemporaries. In 1851 Hudson calls him "a critic of rare taste and judgment" (*Hudson*, vol. 1, p. 4). Whipple in the

same year says : " His introductions to the plays are really additions to the higher Shakspearian criticism, not so much for any peculiar felicity in the analysis of character, as in the view, partly bibliographical, partly philosophical, which he takes of the gradual development of Shakspeare's mind and the different stages of its growth. It is the first connected attempt to trace out Shakspeare's intellectual history and character. . . . In this portion of his labors, Mr. Verplanck has shown a solidity and independence of judgment, and a power of clearly appreciating almost every opinion from which he dissents, which give to his own views the fairness and weight of judicial decisions. His defects as a critic are principally those which come from the absence in part of sensitive sympathies, and of the power of sharp, minute, exhaustive analysis. He is of the school of Hallam, a school in which judgment and generalization rule with such despotic control, that the heart and imagination hardly have fair play and strongly marked individualities too often subside into correct generalities" (*Essays and Reviews* by Edwin P. Whipple, 1851, vol. II, pp. 215 and 216). Richard Grant White in his *Shakspeare's Scholar*, 1854, p. 30, thus justly sums up Verplanck's merits : " Mr. Verplanck's labors were more eclectic than speculative. Forming his text rather upon the labors of Mr. Collier, Mr. Knight, and Mr. Dyce, than upon original investigation and collation, and exercising a taste naturally fine, and disciplined by studies in a wide field of letters, he produced an edition of Shakspeare, which with regard to texts and comments, is, perhaps, preferable to any other which exists."

In 1848, in New York, there appeared a reprint of the Harness edition of Shakspeare : "*The complete Works of William Shakspeare* : with a glossary, and a memoir of the author, by the Rev. William Harness, M. A., of Christ's College, Cambridge, and minister of St. Pancras Parochial

Chapel, Regent Square. With a portrait from the Chandos picture, engraved by Cochran, and forty beautiful illustrations, from designs by Smirke, Westall, Corbould, Stephanoff, and Wright. To which is appended a supplement, comprising the seven dramas which have been ascribed to his pen, but which are not included with his writings in modern editions. Edited, with notes, and an introduction to each play, by William Gilmore Simms, Esq. In two volumes. London: Scott, Webster & Geary. New York: George F. Cooledge & Brother. 4°, 25½ cm." The title-page to the supplement reads: "A supplement to the plays of William Shakespeare: comprising the seven dramas, which have been ascribed to his pen, but which are not included with his writings in modern editions, namely: The two noble kinsmen, The London prodigal, Thomas Lord Cromwell, Sir John Oldcastle, The Puritan, or the widow of Watling Street, The Yorkshire Tragedy, The tragedy of Locrine. Edited, with notes, and an introduction to each play, by William Gilmore Simms, Esq. The first American edition. New York: Published by George F. Cooledge & Brother. 1848. 4°, 25½ cm."

The first part follows the Harness edition, London, 1825, with the omission of part of the appendix and Rowe's and Pope's prefaces. The order of the plays is the same, but the poems have been transferred from the beginning to the end of the plays. The introductions and short end-notes have been retained, but all the footnotes have been omitted. Instead of the portraits is the Chandos picture, engraved by J. Cochran. Poor wood-cuts have been made from the steel engravings of the Harness 1833 London edition.

In the supplement by Simms the illustrations are taken from Knight's *Pictorial edition*. *The two Noble Kinsmen* is reprinted from the same and all the introductions and also the footnotes to *The two Noble Kinsmen* are founded upon

those of Knight. The remaining plays have evidently been taken from Malone's *Supplement*, 1778, from which some of the signed notes have been copied, whence others, merely abridged, have been taken without credit. The original work of Simms deals with textual and verbal criticism, except in the *General Introduction*, where he states his reasons for printing these doubtful plays. Altho he expressly says his object is "not to assert, or even to assume, that the writings in question are those of Shakespeare, or so to argue as in any wise to give a direction to the question which denies their legitimacy, but simply to enable the reader to be sure that he loses nothing, even of what is puerile and immature, in the writings of so great a master (*Gen'l Int.*, p. 12, vol. 2), still he himself evidently believes them to be largely genuine youthful productions and evidences of the intellectual growth of the great master's mind. "We are pleased to see how, feebly, step by step, he has continued to struggle, onward and upward, until, from awkwardness, he arrives at grace; from weakness, he has grown to strength; from a crude infancy, he has risen into absolute majesty and manhood" (*Gen'l Int.*, vol. 2, p. 4). Thus he ranks himself under Verplanck's banner. This William Gilmore Simms, born in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1806, was one of the most popular and prolific writers of his day. He altered Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* for the stage and delivered a course of three lectures on *The Moral Character of Hamlet*, which placed him among the philosophical critics. His editorial work was of no special worth.

In 1850, J. O. Halliwell began an edition of Shakespeare in New York, in numbers, which was soon discontinued. Why, is explained in the following preface. This preface to a volume of comedies published in London in 1854 is here reproduced entire, principally because of its rarity, only

twenty copies having been printed, and because of its reference to one of our esteemed American editors :

“The publication of the present work commenced in numbers in New York, in the year 1850, and the first number was also published in October, 1850, by Mr. Vickers, of Holywell Street, London, the latter issue being wholly unauthorized by me, as may be seen from a correspondence which appeared in the *Times* in that month. The *Comedies* were completed in the following year (1851), and soon afterwards a portion of the *Histories* was printed, when, owing to the work being pirated by other parties, and the fact of its original publication in the United States precluding any expectation of obtaining redress, it was discontinued.

“I have only the opportunity of issuing *twenty* copies in the present form, by attaching a title-page and these few lines to that number of sets of the *Comedies* obtained from the original publisher ; and although there is much in the following notes and introductions I could desire to elaborate or alter, yet I somewhat regret my inability to make a more extensive publication, not merely from the fact of the pirated edition by Messrs. John Tallis & Co. being replete with oversights not to be ascribed to myself, but also because many of my notes have been almost literally adopted by an American editor,—the Rev. Mr. Hudson,—without the slightest acknowledgment. The system of editors of Shakespeare adopting the notes of their predecessors, and availing themselves of the results of their reading, as if it were their own, cannot be too strongly deprecated. Whatever is worth taking does, at least, also deserve a line of recognition.

“Any student of Shakespeare into whose hands a copy of the present volume may chance to be placed, will particularly oblige by considering it to contain all really belonging to me to be found partially repeated in the pirated cheap editions hitherto issued under my name ; especially in that published in three volumes of this size, by Messrs. John Tallis & Co.

J. O. Halliwell.

Avenue Lodge, Brixton Hill. 3rd February, 1854.”

The pirated edition has the following title page : “The complete works of Shakspeare, revised from the original editions with historical and analytical introductions to each play, also notes explanatory and critical, and a life of the poet : by J. O. Halliwell, Esq., F. R. S., F. S. A., member of the council of the Shakspeare society, etc., etc. ; and other eminent commentators. Elegantly and appropriately illustrated by portraits engraved on steel, from daguerreotypes of the greatest and most intellectual actors of the age, taken

in the embodiment of the varied and life-like characters of our great national poet. Printed and published by John Tallis and company, London and New York [1850-'53]. 4 v. 4°, 28 cm."

It was finished in four volumes by Henry Tyrrell, is a London edition, and therefore has nothing to do with American criticism.

The reverend gentleman so unfavorably mentioned in the above preface by Halliwell was Henry Norman Hudson (1814-1886), born in Vermont and bred in early life as farmer and coach-maker. Finally, in 1840, he succeeded in completing a course of study at Middleton and afterward taught school in Kentucky and Alabama. There is a story current that in Kentucky, thro' the influence of a New England woman, also a teacher, he was first instigated, at the age of thirty years, to read Shakespeare. Hudson, however, unconsciously contradicts this report in his edition of Shakespeare, 1851, vol. 3, p. 142, in the Introduction to *As you like it*, when he writes, "Rosalind was in love, as I have been with the comedy these forty years." This is, of course, an exaggeration. Hudson was, in 1851, but thirty-seven years of age; still it implies a life-long acquaintanceship with Shakespeare.

After leaving the South, he edited for a few years the *New York Churchman*, later the *American Church Monthly*. He was ordained priest in the Episcopal church in Litchfield, Conn., 1858-1860, went as chaplain during the Civil War and finally became Professor of Shakespeare in Boston University. In 1844 he began writing lectures on Shakespeare, which he is known to have delivered in many parts of the country: in Baltimore in 1846, as reported in *The Western Continent* of that year; in New York, according to the *New York World*, Dec. 14, 1860, Feb. 9, 1861 (Barton Catalog under Hudson, p. 131).

In 1851-1856 he brought out: "The works of Shakespeare: the text carefully restored according to the first editions; with introductions, notes original and selected, and a life of the poet; by the Rev. H. N. Hudson, A. M. In eleven volumes. Boston and Cambridge: James Monroe and Company. 1851-'56." Portrait: the Chandos. Woodcuts. 12°, 18½ cm. The editor announces in the Preface (vol. 1, p. vii), that this is an American issue of the Chiswick edition of 1826, retaining its advantages without its defects. He also says (p. vii) that the Chiswick edition had never been reprinted in this country, a rather astonishing statement when we remember that we have above counted up to 1850 some fifteen editions reprinted from the Chiswick, in New York, Hartford, and Boston, including Peabody's, which takes Singer for the basis in both notes and text, changing the latter only to restore the first folio readings (Peabody, 1836, vol. 1, *Advertisement*). Hudson likewise asserts that the chief standard of the true text is the folio of 1623, and makes the presumptuous statement: * "If a thorough revisal of every line, every word, every letter, and every point, with a continual reference to the original copies, be a reasonable ground of confidence, then we can confidently assure the reader that he will here find the genuine text of Shakespeare" (vol. 1, p. viii).

It would not be practicable, even if worth while, to give a list of the many textual changes introduced by Hudson, most of them unnecessary or unimportant and most of them not from the first folio or quartos, but from other critics. His original emendations have little force. The Cambridge edition records Hudson's recklessness in this line. In the *Tempest* there are 22 emendations, aside from those of the first folio, six of them original, the remaining from Daniel, Wright, Spedding, Crosby, etc. Many of the other plays have an equal or greater number of unwarranted changes.

The termination *ed* of the verbs, participles and participial adjectives, because it affects the rhythm, is printed with scrupulous adherence to the original text. "In size of volume, in type, and style of execution" (vol. 1, p. vii), the Chiswick edition has been exactly followed. Even the wood-cuts have been reproduced. Many of Singer's foot-notes have been omitted as superfluous, many abridged and condensed, and others added, drawing "with the utmost freedom from all the sources accessible" (vol. 1, p. xii). "The notes written or compiled by the American editor are discriminated by the signature 'H'" (vol. 1, p. xi).

As a good specimen of the notes signed "H," two are quoted out of a large number of similar ones:—Singer, 1826, vol. 1, *Tempest*, p. 70: "5. That is, bring *more than are sufficient*. 'Corollary the addition or vantage above measure, an *overplus*, or *surplusage*.'—Blount;" Hudson, vol. 1, p. 81: "6. *i. e.*, bring more than enough; *corollary* meaning a surplus number. H."—Singer, vol. 1, p. 70: "6. *Stover* is fodder for cattle, as hay, straw, and the like; *estovers* is the old law term, it is from *estourvier*, old French;" —Hudson, vol. 1, p. 81, note 7: "Stover is fodder for cattle, as hay, straw, and such like; still used thus in the north of England. H."

In spite of the expressed desire "to encumber his [Shakespeare's] language with no more, in the shape of comment, than is necessary to render the text intelligible" (vol. 1, p. xii), there are many notes like the following:—vol. 1, *Tempest*, Act I, Sc. 1, pp. 17 f.—"Play the men, note 3. That is, act with spirit, behave like men. Thus Baret in his *Alvearie*: '*To play the man*, or to show himself a valiant man in any matter;' " vol. 1, *ibid.*, Sc. 2.—"Not a soul but felt a fever of the mad, note 23. That is, such a fever as madmen feel when the frantic fit is on them."

Hudson's most valued work was done in the lengthy

Introductions to each play, wherein he disavows any claim to originality. His "leading purpose is to gather up all the historical information that has yet been made accessible" (vol. 1, p. xii), especially the results of the "indefatigable labours" of Collier and others. In these introductions the state of the original text, the date of the play, when printed, and the source are discussed, together with analyses of and criticisms of the plays, the latter founded mainly upon his lectures, published in two volumes in New York in 1848. These lectures are frequently merely rearranged and then incorporated verbatim in the introductions, so that it is almost impossible to treat them separately. It is in this field that Hudson has done his best work. He is of the school of Coleridge, Hazlitt, and Lamb, a philosophical, or, better, a subjective critic, representing himself as a mere mouth-piece of their opinions. "If I know my own mind," he says, "I have rather studied to avoid originality than to be original" (*Lectures*, vol. 1, p. vi). And again (vol. 2, p. 143), "whatever may be their [his remarks'] demerits, I am sure they have not the demerit of originality." This recalls *Richard III's*, "I thank my God for my humility."

To the Chiswick edition, which omitted the poems, a supplementary volume was added containing a life of Shakespeare, an historical sketch of the English drama before Shakespéare, poems and sonnets. Rowe's account of the poet's life forms an introductory chapter to *The Life of Shakespeare*. That "Rowe's account" is reprinted from Verplanck's edition rather than from the original source is evident from the following agreements: Verplanck, 1847, vol. 1, *Life*, p. 6, "in the times of Henry V and Henry VI;" Rowe, 1709, vol. 1, p. ix, and all the others: "*Henry the Fifth's* and *Henry the Sixth's Times*;" but Hudson follows Verplanck. Again Verplanck, vol. 1, p. 7, "gave him these four lines of verse;" Rowe, vol. 1, p. xxxvi,

and others, "gave him these four verses ;" Hudson the same as Verplanck.

Of Hudson's *Life of Shakespeare* (vol. XI, pp. xix-clxxviii), he himself says : " The labours of Rowe, Malone, Collier, and Halliwell are all before us. . . . Of course no means of adding to the stock of matter lie within our reach, even if we had ever so much time and skill to prosecute such researches ; so that the most we can hope for is, to put into a compact and readable shape what others have collected." And of his sketch of the Drama he writes (vol. XI, p. clxxx) : " Ample materials for the work are furnished to our hand in Warton's *History of English Poetry* and Collier's *Annals of the Stage*, so that the only merit or demerit we can claim is in selecting and condensing the matter as may best agree with our judgment and our space." Also nearly one-half of the last chapter of his *History of the Drama*, entitled *General Criticism*, is quoted directly from Coleridge.

Hudson's criticisms of Shakespeare are at once a defense and a song of praise. Replying to the eighteenth century, which affirmed that the Poet was the product of a rude age and without art, he says : " The ages of Pericles, of Augustus, and of Leo, all together, can hardly show so much wealth of genius and of culture, as the single age of Elizabeth " (*Lectures*, vol. 1, p. 99). And in some twelve pages (vol. 1, pp. 147-159) he discusses the difference between the classic and the romantic drama : the characteristic of the classic drama is simplicity ; that of the romantic is complexity ; each contains its laws within itself. " It is vain, therefore, to quarrel with the Shakspearian drama for departing from the classic models. The spirit of modern culture could no more have organized itself into the classic form than the soul of an eagle could organize itself into the form of a fish " (vol. 1, p. 158).

"In the romantic drama, therefore, the unities of time and place must obviously give way to higher and more important relations;" they "have nothing whatever to do, save as an altogether subordinate concern" (vol. 1, p. 164). "He [Shakespeare] showed himself the skilfulest of artists as well as the profoundest of philosophers; and his achievements are not more astonishing than his plans were judicious" (vol. 1, p. 166). "Shakspeare understood them [the unities] perfectly. He was the intimate friend of Ben Jonson, who understood the unities as well as Aristotle himself did" (vol. 1, p. 164). "I endeavored to vindicate Shakspeare from the criticisms of the dissecting school. . . . That Shakspeare developed his subjects organically and according to their innate laws, not according to any system of external rules, was spoken of as the crowning excellence of his works" (vol. 1, p. 167). Moreover Shakespeare lacked neither taste nor judgment (vol. 1, pp. 167-192). Shakespeare's so-called ignorance is thus excused: "But, inasmuch as Shakespeare's geography and chronology are always accurate enough when such accuracy will serve the purpose of his art, it seems rather questionable whether in this case his inaccuracy should be set down to ignorance. Perhaps, after all, he showed as much knowledge here as he meant to show; and he must have been ignorant indeed, not to know that his geography was incorrect. It should be borne in mind that his purpose was art, not science (vol. 1, p. 113, Introduction, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*). Neither does he agree with the utilitarian views held by some critics with reference to Shakespeare's aims, altho his utterances upon this subject became entangled in contradictions. Shakespeare did not toil for "money and bread, altogether thoughtless and reckless of fame" (*Lectures*, vol. 1, p. 39). With reference to Shakespeare's marriage he says in 1848 (vol. 1, p. 8), "though no stain appears on the private character of

either Shakspeare or his matron bride the union did not prove a fortunate one." But in 1856 he has changed his opinion: "Some of the Poet's later biographers and critics have taken it upon them to suppose that he was not happy in his marriage" (Edition 1856, vol. XI, p. lxxiii). But there is no proof of this: "The darling object of his London life evidently was,—that he might return to his native town with a handsome competence, and dwell in the bosom of his family" (*ibid.*, p. lxxiv). Shakespeare he regards as a great moral teacher: "For my part, I dare be known to think Shakspeare's works a far better school of virtuous discipline than half the moral and religious books which are now put into the hands of youth" (*Lectures*, vol. 1, p. 79). "His [Shakespeare's] choice of a subject [the plot of *Measure for Measure*] so ugly in itself is amply justified by the many sweet lessons of virtue and wisdom which he has used it as an opportunity of delivering. To have trained and taught a barbarous tale of cruelty and lust into such a rich mellow fruitage of poetry and humanity, may be safely left to offset whatsoever of offence there may be in the play to modern taste" (Edition 1851, vol. 2, Int., p. 9). Even the poems can do no harm: "The vapours of sensual emotion are constantly blown away by the strong gale of thoughts and images, which rushes through the reader's mind, and the triumph of the author's genius over the impurity of the subject is rendered complete. One has little motive to read it for an ill purpose, he has to work so hard in order to follow it" (*Lectures*, vol. 1, pp. 27 f.). Again "The poetry—or the philosophy which represents virtue and vice as sure of present recompense, is a lie, and as such can only come directly or indirectly, of the father of lies. And Shakspeare was just as far from stealing the robes of Satan to serve heaven in, as from stealing the robes of heaven to serve Satan in. Accordingly he gave his characters, good and bad,

a sphere wherein to develop themselves, and then dismissed them, as nature and as God dismisses them, into a higher order of things, to receive their reward or suffer their retribution" (*Lectures*, vol. 1, pp. 83 f.).

Shakespeare also probably wrote history with a purpose. Hudson finds nothing incredible in the tradition handed down by Gildon that Shakespeare "in a conversation with Ben Jonson, said that, 'finding the nation generally very ignorant of history, he wrote his historical plays in order to instruct the people in that particular.' That he cared to make the stage a place of instruction as well as of pastime, appears in his Prologue to *Henry viii*, where he says—'Such as give their money out of hope they may here find truth too'" (Edition 1852, vol. VI, *Int. Henry vi*, part 1, p. 6).

The doctrine of the intellectual growth of Shakespeare's mind, so elaborated by Verplanck, is upheld by Hudson, in spite of one statement which seems to indicate the contrary: "That harmony and completeness of mind, which others attain only by the longest and hardest labor, they [Homer and Shakespeare] seem to have brought into the world with them. A Milton and Schiller, however, struggle forth slowly and painfully into development, by parts and degrees" (*Lectures*, vol. 1, p. 113). But elsewhere (*Lectures*, vol. 1, p. 220) he states in no indefinite terms: "I should be tempted to call this play [*Two Gentlemen of Verona*] the infant smile of Shakespeare's genius; it proves, what many seem to have doubted, that his genius had an infancy; that it was not born full grown, ripe, and ready for service, but had to creep, totter and prattle; much observation, study, practice, experience, being required to develop it into manhood and maturity."

Hudson dwells especially upon the *organic unity* of Shakespeare's dramatic composition and characterization. "Inci-

dents and characters were to be represented, not in the order of sensible juxtaposition or procession, but in that of cause and effect, of principle and consequence" (Ed., vol. XI, p. cccxxiii). "Organic structure" means "vital unity" like that of a "tree, which is in truth made up of a multitude of little trees, all growing from a common root, nourished by a common sap and bound together in a common life" (vol. XI, p. cccxxviii). "The organic fitness and correspondence of part with part . . . is equally maintained in his individual characterization; . . . in his works, far more than in almost any others, everything appears to come, not from him, but from the characters. . . . The reason of which must be, that the word is most admirably suited to the character, the character to the word" (*ibid.*, p. cccxxxvi). Other authors "began at the surface, and worked the other way." Shakespeare "begins at the heart of a character, and unfolds it outwards, forming and compacting all the internal parts and organs as he unfolds it" (*ibid.*, p. cccxxxii).

In the *Lectures* of 1848 Hudson's style is often high-flown, witty, sarcastic, brilliant, exceedingly addicted to the antithetical balanced structure, on the whole pleasing and popular. But in the *Introductions* to the plays of his edition of Shakespeare 1851-56 the diction is smoother and more dignified. The wit and excessive antithesis of those first efforts are not so evident and scarcely appear except where the lectures have been bodily transferred to the *Introductions*.

Finally, in Hudson, the new criticism of the nineteenth century appears in full swing, the subjective criticism, under the guidance of Coleridge and Schlegel, determined to praise and pardon and intolerant of any unfavorable comment of one whom they delight to call not only the greatest of all poets, but also the greatest of all dramatic artists.

Hudson's edition met with the approbation of the critics

of his day. In the *North American Review*, vol. 84, 1857, p. 203, Edward S. Gould says that *Redfield's Collier's* has the best of all texts. "On the other hand, as to the size of volume, typographical arrangement, completeness of explanatory notes, and full analysis of the characters of the plays, with their histories, Mr. Hudson's work may safely challenge competition with the long array of his predecessors." "Chronologically speaking, this method of analyzing the poet's characters is *after* that of Coleridge and of Mrs. Jameson; but Mr. Hudson has so improved on his models, that he is but little more indebted to them, than Shakespeare was to his predecessors for the plots of his plays" (*ibid.*, p. 201). And Richard Grant White in his edition of *Shakespeare*, 1857-66, vol. 1, footnote, p. cclxxix, writes: "Two editions of remarkable merit were afterwards published in the United States: one by the Hon. Gulian C. Verplanck, and the other by the Rev. Mr. Hudson. These editors, however, formed their text rather upon an eclectic study of the labors of their immediate predecessors than upon a collation of the old readings, or even a thorough investigation of the whole field of Shakespearian textual criticism. Mr. Verplanck's edition is distinguished by the judgment, taste, and scholarship which guided his editorial labors; Mr. Hudson's by the originality of thought and vigor of style in the critical essays which precede each play."

Meanwhile had appeared: "*The Works of Shakespeare*, the text regulated by the recently discovered folio of 1632, containing early manuscript emendations, with a history of the stage, a life of the poet, and an introduction to each play by J. Payne Collier, Esq., F. S. A. To which are added, glossarial and other notes and the readings of former editions. Redfield: New York, 1853, i-cvii, 1-968 pp. Portrait, the Droeshout. Illustrations. 1 vol. 4°, 25 cm." The editor, Mr. George Long Duyckinck (1822-63), an accom-

plished scholar of New York city, says in the preface that the text of the plays is from J. Payne Collier's edition published in London a few months previous, "embodying the manuscript emendations recently discovered by him in a copy of the second folio edition of 1632. The text of the *Poems*, the *Life of Shakespeare*, the account of the early English Drama, and the separate prefaces [printed all together at the beginning of the plays] are from the octavo edition in 1844, by the same editor." New footnotes were added "illustrative of obsolete words, expressions and customs . . . derived from . . . Collier, Knight's *Pictorial Shakspeare*, . . . Dyce, Douce, Halliwell, Hunter, Richardson, . . . Verplanck and Hudson, with such aid as a long acquaintance with the Dramatic and general Literature of the age of Elizabeth and James could furnish." "Notes, pointing out or commenting upon the sentiments expressed in the text, have been purposely avoided, it being presumed that the reader having been furnished with every material for the employment of a correct taste and judgment, will prefer to exercise these faculties for himself." "Comment of this description, which has often been carried to an impertinent or tedious extreme, has also been avoided in noting the variations between the text of the present and that of previous editions. The reader has been placed in possession of the old by the side of the new readings, and left to an unbiased choice between them" (*Preface*, pp. 3, 4). This recalls the tone of protest heard against verbal criticism in the *Advertisement* to the 1795 edition.

The editor's principal merit, little as it was and long since out of date, was stated in a complimentary notice by Edward S. Gould, which appeared in the *North American Review* of January, 1857, pp. 202 f.: "So far as the text of Shakespeare is concerned, we consider Redfield's reprint of Collier altogether the best edition that ever has been published.

Collier's volume was incomplete in this respect,—that while it contained all the MS. annotator's corrections, it did not designate where the corrections were made. In Redfield's edition these are all, or nearly all, pointed out by footnotes at the bottom of each page."

The same edition without the portrait and illustrations, and with the *Introductions* placed before the respective plays, was also issued in eight volumes by Redfield, in the same year, 1853, 16°, 17 cm., and the Barton Catalog 101 records what is doubtless but another edition of Redfield's one volume publication: "*The works of Shakespeare*. The text regulated by the recently discovered folio of 1632, containing early manuscript emendations. With a history of the stage, a life of the poet, and an introduction to each play by J. P. Collier. To which are added, glossarial and other notes and the readings of former editions. Redfield: New York, 1857 (1) 4, (1) cvii, 966 pp. Portrait, the Droeshout. Illustrated. 8°. The engraved title-page is dated 1853" (Barton Catalog, 101).

Charles Knight's edition, "*The comedies, histories, tragedies, and poems of William Shakspeare*, with a biography, and studies of his works by Charles Knight. Pictorial and national edition. In 8 v. Boston: Little Brown, and co. 1853, 8°," is "the London edition with a new title page" according to the Barton Catalog, 89.

In 1854-56, Martin and Johnson brought out a pretentious three-volume edition: "*The complete works of Shakespeare*, from the original text: carefully collated and compared with the editions of Halliwell, Knight, and Collier: with historical and critical introductions, and notes to each play; and a life of the great dramatist, by Charles Knight. Illustrated with new and finely executed steel engravings, chiefly portraits in character of celebrated American actors, drawn from life, expressly for this edition. New York:

Martin, Johnson, and company. [1854–1856.] 3 vols. i-liv. 1725 pp. Portrait, the Chandos. 4°, 28 cm.” The engraved title-pages of vols. two and three are dated 1856. The illustrations are dated 1854–1856. The publishers announce in the preface that “this is the first illustrated quarto edition that has appeared for many years, and the first that has ever been issued in this country” (vol. 1, p. v). “The text was . . . carefully collated by a competent Shakespearian scholar with the editions of the three most distinguished Shakespearian editors of the day—John Payne Collier, Charles Knight, and James Orchard Halliwell; and the notes are from the pen of the latter gentleman and of other eminent commentators [without credit]. . . . The same care was taken with the historical and critical introductions, which contain the united judgments of the most distinguished Shakespearian critics and antiquaries of the past and present times. . . . The result is . . . an edition which unites elegance of form, richness and interest of illustration, purity of text, and valuable editorial matter, in a greater degree than any other that has ever been offered to the American public” (vol. 1, pp. v f.).

A collation of all the *Introductions* and notes (inconveniently collected at the end of each play) and the text of one play, *Richard III*, proves conclusively that Tallis’s pirated copy of Halliwell, London and New York, 1850–53, has been the basis. *Richard III* is reprinted exactly even to punctuation and peculiar divisions of the lines. The textual deviations are from the Perkins folio as found in Collier, 1853. The introductions and notes of *The Tempest*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Merry Wives of Windsor* and *Measure for Measure* are reprinted verbatim from Tallis. The introductions and notes to all the historical plays and the tragedies are taken from Tallis changed only in the introductions by abridgment, often three pages of Tallis

appearing as one page in Martin-Johnson; see *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *Lear*, the omissions being usually the character-analyses. In the introductions to *Titus Andronicus* and *Cymbeline* alone are sentences re-worded, one in each. Only about one-half of the notes to most of the plays are retained, and the others are often abridged. Once only has Martin's editor forgot himself and assigned the notes to their rightful owner, H. T. [Henry Tyrrell], the notes to *King Henry IV*, part 1, being signed "H. T."

But the introductions and notes to *Comedy of Errors*, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Love's Labour's Lost*, *Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Merchant of Venice*, *As you like it*, *Taming of the Shrew*, *All's well that ends well*, *Twelfth Night* and *Winter's Tale* are not from Tallis but seem composed by a different and more independent hand, altho they are compilations from Collier, Knight, the 1826 Variorum, etc., dealing mainly with the sources and dates of the respective plays and very little with subjective criticism. Possibly they are reprinted from some edition which the writer has not seen. The order also of these last mentioned comedies differs from that of Tallis, to follow Collier. Hence we see that whatever merit this edition may have lies in the textual emendations made, according to the Preface, "by a competent Shakespearian scholar." But, judging of the text from *Richard III*, what is not Tallis's is from the Perkins folio. However, the other plays may offer bolder changes, for in the first and second acts of *Much Ado About Nothing*, Imogen is given "a few unimportant speeches, hitherto assigned to Leonato" because it seems unlikely to the editor that Imogen should be twice introduced in the stage direction in the original, "had she not been intended by the poet for one of the characters" (vol. 1, note 1, p. 257). The suggestion for illustrations was taken from the Tallis edition. The latter has steel engravings of the greatest actors of the world; Martin-

Johnson & Co. have steel engravings of the most celebrated American actors.

In 1855 appeared another one-volume edition of the great poet, called "*Jewett's Collier's Edition: The complete works of William Shakespeare*, comprising his plays and poems, with a history of the stage, a life of the poet, and an introduction to each play; the text of the plays corrected by the manuscript emendations contained in the recently discovered folio of 1632. By J. Payne Collier, Esq., F. S. A. To which are added, glossarial and explanatory notes, and notes to the emendations, containing the readings of former editions, by John L. Jewett. With new and original designs by T. H. Matteson, Engraved by Alexander Anderson. New York: Published by George F. Cooledge & Brother. [1855]. 4°, 25 cm." Portrait, the Chandos, engraved by J. Cochran, the same as in the Harness 1848 edition of Cooledge & Brother. The "new and original designs" are wretched wood-cuts. The Preface (pp. v f.) says: "Convinced from the conclusions of able critics, and from our own examination, that Mr. Collier's text of Shakespeare, embodying the emendations of the folio of 1632, is far the most perfect extant, it has been made the basis of the present edition." "Being without notes, or any means of distinguishing the new readings, for the present work we have collated it with the best modern editions, principally with those of Verplanck and Singer, and denoted its variations from them by figures, which are placed before the word or passage referred to. The reading of former editions is inserted under corresponding figures, in the 'Notes to the Emendations' at the close of the volume. The means are thus furnished not only of comparing this edition with previous ones, but of restoring the former reading whenever desirable. Our text of the Poems is from Collier's edition of 1844." Collier's *History of the English Stage to the Time of Shakespeare*, the *Life of Shakespeare*, and the introductions

to the plays, all abridged, are also from Collier's edition of 1844. The introductions are bunched together after the *Life*, as previously by Redfield in 1853, who had likewise noted the ms. emendations (p. vi). "More than ordinary pains have been bestowed upon the footnotes of this edition, in order to obviate the necessity of looking beyond the volume itself for anything needful to its proper elucidation" (p. vi). The editorial work, eclectic and devoted entirely to textual and glossarial criticism, is of no especial value.

We now come to one who has been heralded as the greatest of American editors and one with whom the present investigation must close. From 1857 to 1866 there appeared: "*The Works of William Shakespeare*, the plays edited from the folio of MDCXXIII, with various readings from all the editions and all the commentators, notes, introductory remarks, a historical sketch of the text, an account of the rise and progress of the English drama, a memoir of the poet, and an essay upon his genius. By Richard Grant White. Boston: Little Brown and Company. 1857-1866. 12mo, 20 cm. Portraits, Illustrations, Facsimiles. The portraits are, in vol. 1, the Felton, in vol. 2, the Droeshout" (Barton Cat., 102). The *Memoirs* are illustrated with seven wood-cuts. "The utmost care has been taken to present Shakespeare's words as nearly as possible with syllabic faithfulness to the form in which he and his contemporaries used them; such faithfulness, it need hardly be said, not requiring, except in extremely rare instances, a conformity to the irregular orthography of the Elizabethan period" (vol. II, p. 5). "The edition has thus far been punctuated with great care;—the first time that that by no means trifling task has ever been performed for these works, except with regard to passages which have been discussed as obscure, or which are entirely deformed by the punctuation of the first folio." "The editor has confined his labors

to the text and to subjects directly connected with it. . . . Such views as he may wish to express of any particular work, passage, or character of Shakespeare's . . . he will hereafter present by themselves" (vol. II, p. 5). White insists, as Hudson before him had done, upon the importance of exactness in reprinting the text of the folio, especially in final *ed* and contractions. "I am, however," he remarks, "no champion of the readings of the first folio, as such; . . . in those cases [where it is corrupt] it is to be corrected boldly" (vol. I, p. x).

Hence it is to textual criticism alone that this edition, called epoch-making [Knortz, p. 43], owes its main value. A table printed in volume XII shows in convenient form the textual changes made by White, some fifteen pages of them, enough surely "to awaken some solicitude in the editor, . . . were he not conscious of the reverent spirit in which the corrections have been made, and the logical conditions to which he held himself inexorably bound, even after perception and judgment had done their work" (vol. II; p. 2). An investigation of the emendations, however, reveals the fact that he, like many of his predecessors, fell short of his high aims. For many of the changes are unnecessary, and some of them, to say the least, no improvement; *Love's Labour's Lost*, Act I, Sc. 1, "You three, *Birone*, R. G. W.;" Act I, Sc. 2, "*Mote* (not moth) the name of the page, R. G. W.;" Act IV, Sc. 3, "and so say I, and *ay* [I, f.] the fool;" *ibid.*, "it kills me, *ay* [I, f.];" *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act V, Sc. 2, "*Though* the house give glimmering light, R. G. W." [The folio *Through* is better]. His "Table of Readings, etc.," exhibits several inaccuracies: *e. g.*, *Merchant of Venice*, Act I, Sc. 3, "*land-thieves* and *water-thieves*, R. G. W.;" but *land* thieves and *water* thieves, *Singer edition* 2, *Eccles* conjecture, (*Cambridge ed.*, p. 348). On the other hand, most of the emendations are made sanely,

wild guesses are avoided, and there is an effort, even if not always successful, to be conservative, *i. e.*, to follow, whenever possible, the first folio or the best quartos.

The introductions and the notes, collected at the end of each play in the inconvenient fashion started by Verplanck, are brief and deal only with "the formation and maintenance of a sound text, and the explanation of obsolete phrases and customs" (vol. 1, *Preface*, p. xxviii). He resists "all temptations to expressions of individual admiration and to esthetic criticism. Neither the Antony nor the Brutus of my hero, I come neither to bury nor to praise him" (*ibid.*). It is interesting to compare Richard Grant White's *Introductions* with those of Hudson. Barring the extensive subjective criticism of the latter, nearly every point discussed at length by Hudson, is taken up and tersely stated by White, who usually agrees with Hudson's conclusions, altho often arguing them out more clearly and vigorously than Hudson. When not Hudson, then Knight, Collier, or Verplanck, were the suggestive basis. The only original work claimed by Richard Grant White in these *Introductions* is carefully set down in the "Table of Readings, etc." (vol. XII : A) :—*The Merry Wives of Windsor, Introduction* : "The order and date of the production of the Falstaff plays, and the evidence of the hasty writing of the first sketch of this comedy. The two parts of *Henry IV* were written as early as 1597 ; . . . *Henry V* was written in 1599 ; . . . the first sketch of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was written in some odd fortnight of 1598. It was enlarged and perfected in or after 1603, as appears from the allusion to the copious creation of knights by James I, which took place in that year ; and by the fine passage in the Fairy Scene alluding to Windsor and the Order of the Garter" (vol. 2, p. 207). *Measure for Measure* : "Period of the action. The period of the action of this play, which has been hitherto considered, and even pronounced, to be

undeterminable, is clearly defined [to be 1485] by the first few lines of the second Scene of the first Act, and by our knowledge of the source of the plot" (vol. 3, p. 9). *The Comedy of Errors*: "The manner and time of the production of the play. . . . In the extravagant Scenes, he deliberately imitated . . . the versification of the old play [a rude imitation of the *Menaechmi*] and perhaps adopted some of it with improvement; . . . this was done about 1589-90; and the play thus produced may have been somewhat rewritten by him in its first and last Scenes in the long period during which it remained unprinted in the possession of the theatre" (vol. 3, pp. 137 f.) *Much ado about nothing*: "That the motive of the play is much ado about *noting*; and that its name was accordingly pronounced: 'nothing' having been pronounced *noting* in Shakespeare's day." *A Midsummer Night's Dream*: "Shakespeare the first to bring fairies upon the stage, and to call Robin Goodfellow Puck or Hobgoblin. This comedy probably one of author's early works." *Taming of the Shrew*: "Three hands traceable in it. The old *Taming of a Shrew* probably written by Greene, Marlowe, and perhaps Shakespeare." This sums up Richard Grant White's original contribution to the *Introductions*; but he concerned himself still further with an elaborate argument "on the Authorship of the three parts of King Henry the Sixth" (vol. VII, pp. 403-468). It had been originally printed for private circulation, twenty-five copies, slightly different, by the Riverside Press: H. O. Houghton and Co. Cambridge, Mass., 1859, and dedicated to Charles Eliot Norton. The result of the long dissertation is the conclusion that about 1587 or 1588, Shakespeare was engaged to assist Marlowe, Greene, and perhaps Peele, in dramatizing the events of *King Henry the Sixth's* reign; that by his talents in this line he gained promotion and about 1591 undertook to rewrite the three plays in which he had had so large a hand (vol. VII, p. 468).

Richard Grant White entertains only utilitarian views of Shakespeare's motives; "The whole tenor of his life shows that he labored as a playwright solely that he might obtain the means of going back to Stratford to live the life of an independent gentleman" (*Memoirs*, vol. I, p. lxvi). "In writing the Histories he had the same purpose as in writing the Comedies and Tragedies; that purpose always being, to make a good play; and with him a good play was one which would fill the theatre whenever it was performed" (*Introduction to King John*, vol. VI, p. 7). "He wrote Histories because they suited the taste of the day" . . . "not to historical plan or instructive purpose of any kind" do we owe them (*ibid.*, p. 8), contrary to the opinion of Dr. Johnson and Knight.

Altho he merely touches upon the "growth" theory, he evidently believes in it: "The comparatively timid style and unskilful structure of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* show that it was the work of Shakespeare's earliest years as a dramatic writer" (vol. 2, p. 103). Contrary to Hudson, he does not believe that Shakespeare wrote with any moral purpose: "Many people have given themselves serious concern as to the moral influence of Shakespeare's plays; and critics of great weight, fulfilling their function, have gone down far, and staid down long, in the attempt to fathom the profound moral purpose which they were sure must be hidden in the depths of these grand compositions. But the direct moral influence of Shakespeare is nothing, and we may be sure that he wrote with no moral purpose. He sought only to present life; and the world which he shows us, like that in which we live, teaches us moral lessons according to our will and our capacity" (vol. I, p. ccxliv). However, in his *Life and Genius of Shakespeare*, 1865, a separate issue, with very slight changes, of the *Memoirs, Essay on Shakespeare's Genius and the English Drama*, from

volume I of his Edition, etc., p. 240, he says : "there is no moral taint in any of his [Shakespeare's] works,—nothing that can debauch the mind of the pure and innocent."

Richard Grant White had little patience with the German school of Shakespearian criticism : "In plays written as daily labor, by a man who composed sometimes in joint authorship, and who worked over the old material which lay nearest to his hand, and was best suited to his money-making purpose, always saving time and trouble as much as possible,—in such plays, as produced, what folly to seek, as some have sought, a central thought, a great psychological motive !" "From all that we know of Shakespeare and his circumstances, and all that can be extracted from his plays without torture we may be sure that the great central thoughts and inner motives which have been sought out for his various dramas, by critics of the German school, could he but come back and hear them, would excite only his smiling wonder." "Every worthy reader of Shakespeare must see that his peculiar power as a dramatist lies in his treatment of character. . . . *This* was his dramatic art, and this it was in which he had neither teacher nor model" (vol. I, p. ccxxxi). White believes in the absolute impersonality of Shakespeare's characters, with one exception : "Shakespeare *made* souls to his characters ; he did not give them his own." . . . Only in the sonnets "He pours out his own woes with a freedom in which he equals, but with a manliness in which he far surpasses Byron. It is as a dramatist that he is self-oblivious" (vol. I, p. ccxxxiv).

Speaking of Shakespeare's style, he says, "It is not to be defined at all ; it is a mystery."—"The man has never yet written, except Shakespeare, who could produce ten lines having that quality, which, for lack of other name, we call Shakespearian." "He is often undeniably incorrect, in consequence, partly, of the syntactical usage of his day, . . .

and partly of his own neglect to revise carefully that which he wrote so fluently. His occasional errors which are not of the former kind appear only in his plays; they are not found in the poems, which he wrote for perusal" (vol. 1, pp. ccix f.). His versification was full of irregularities. "Yet of all English, as well as of all modern poets, Shakespeare, in respect to his versification as in all other respects is the supreme master" (vol. 1, p. ccix). And the climax of praise is reached in the following: "It is the second-rate men, great yet second, who form schools. . . . But the supremely divine is ever a mystery. This is especially true of Shakespeare" (vol. 1, p. ccli).

Richard Grant White's edition met with a flattering reception. In the *North American Review* of January, 1859, shortly after the appearance of the first four volumes of the *Comedies*, E. A. Abbott devoted some nine pages to a consideration of their merits. According to Abbott, the value of an edition consists in the purity of the text and the character of the notes, and the first great claim of this edition on the public regard is its purity of text, the result of five years of severe revision. "As to explanatory matter, common sense is the characteristic of this edition, both in plan and execution. The first source of interpretation for a doubtful passage is to be found in the context" (p. 251), and Shakespeare is made to elucidate himself. Abbott, however, took White at his word and hence gave but a superficial criticism.

James Russell Lowell made a much more elaborate study of this edition, which he reported in *The Atlantic Monthly*, 1859, January (pp. 111-121) and February (pp. 241-260). His demands for a perfect editor are not so simple as Abbott's: "(1) a thorough glossological knowledge of the English contemporary with Shakespeare; (2) enough logical acuteness of mind and metaphysical training to enable him

to follow recondite processes of thought ; (3) such a conviction of the supremacy of his author as always to prefer his thought to any theory of his own ; (4) a feeling for music, and so much knowledge of the practice of other poets as to understand that Shakespeare's versification differs from theirs as often in kind as in degree ; (5) an acquaintance with the world as well as with books ; (6) what is, perhaps, of more importance than all, so great a familiarity with the working of the imaginative faculty in general, and of its peculiar operation in the mind of Shakespeare, as will . . . enable him to understand fully that the Gothic Shakespeare often superimposed upon the slender column of a single word, that seems to twist under it, but does not,—like the quaint shafts in cloisters,—a weight of meaning which the modern architects of sentences would consider wholly unjustifiable by correct principle. It would be unreasonable to expect a union of all these qualifications in a single man, but we think that Mr. White combines them in larger proportion than any editor with whose labours we are acquainted" (vol. 3, pp. 120 f.). In fact, according to Lowell, he possesses all except the first requisite.

White's faults are thus stated :—"his very acumen sometimes misleads him into fancying a meaning where none exists, or at least none answerable to the clarity and precision of Shakespeare's intellect ; he is too hasty in his conclusions as to the pronunciation of words and the accuracy of rhymes in Shakespeare's day, and he has been seduced into them by what we cannot help thinking a mistaken theory as to certain words, as *moth* and *nothing* for example ; . . . he shows, here and there, a glimpse of Americanism, especially misplaced in an edition of the poet whose works do more than anything else, perhaps, to maintain the sympathy of the English race ; and . . . his prejudice against the famous corrected folio of 1632 leads him to speak slightly of Mr. Collier, to whom

all lovers of our early literature are indebted. . . . But after all these deductions, we remain of the opinion that Mr. White has given us the best edition [for substance, scope, and aim] hitherto published, and we do not like him the less for an occasional crotchet" (January, p. 121). "The chief matter must in all cases be the text, and the faults we find in him do not, as a general rule, affect that" (February, 1859, p. 244).

Mr. Lowell has taken his task very seriously, and painfully compared, "note by note, and reading by reading," White's edition with those of Knight, Collier, and Dyce (*ibid.*, p. 244). "We notice particularly his discussion of the authorship of the verses signed J. M. S. as a good example of the delicacy and acuteness of his criticism." (*ibid.*) "We cannot but commend highly the self-restraint which marks these brief and pithy prefaces, and the pertinency of every sentence to the matter in hand . . . Shakspeare himself has left us a pregnant satire on dogmatical and categorical aesthetics in the closet-scene between Hamlet and Polonius" (*ibid.*, p. 245). . . . "We are glad to see, likewise, with what becoming indifference the matter of Shakspeare's indebtedness to others is treated by Mr. White in his *Introductions*. There are many commentators who seem to think they have wormed themselves into the secret of the Master's inspiration when they have discovered the sources of his plots. But what he took was by right of eminent domain; and was he not to resuscitate a theme and make it immortal, because some botcher had tried his hand upon it before, and left it for stone-dead?" (*ibid.*, p. 245). . . . "The freshness of many of Mr. White's observations struck us with very agreeable surprise . . . we love the expression of honest praise, of sifted and considerate judgment, and we think that a laborious collation justifies us in saying that in acute discrimination of aesthetic shades of

expression, and often of textual niceties, Mr. White is superior to any previous editor" (*ibid.*, p. 246). For some of the many notes which please Mr. Lowell we can only refer to his list on p. 246 of February, 1859. "We quite agree with Mr. White and Mr. Knight in their hearty dislike of the Steevens-system of versification, but we think that Coleridge has misled both of them in what he has said about the pauses and retardations of verses. . . . Mr. White has in many cases wisely and properly made halting verses perfect in their limbs by easy transpositions, and we think he is perfectly right in refusing to interpolate a syllable, but wrong in assuming that we have Shakspeare's metre where we have no metre at all" (*ibid.*, p. 249). He notes two instances where White has altered the text for the worse (*ibid.*, pp. 250 f.): *Tempest*, Act III, Sc. 3, "to belch you up" [F]; and *Comedy of Errors*, Act II, Sc. 2, "thou one dishonoured." In both cases the first folio text might well stand. "We have said, that we considered the style and matter of Mr. White's notes excellent. . . . There are two or three which we think in questionable taste, and one where the temptation to say a sharp thing has led the editor to vulgarize the admirable Benedict, and to misinterpret the text in a way so unusual for him that it is worth a comment; *Much Ado About Nothing*, Act III, Sc. 2, p. 329, note, And when was he wont to *wash his face?*" (p. 251).

Lowell also discovered that White was not accurate: "We have not been at the trouble of verifying every one of Mr. White's 'hithertos,' but we did so in two plays, and found in *Midsummer Night's Dream* four, and in *Much Ado* two cases, where the reading claimed as a restoration occurred also in Mr. Knight's excellent edition of 1842. These oversights do not affect the correctness of Mr. White's text, but they diminish our confidence in the accuracy of the collation to which he lays claim." "The chief objection which we

have to make against Mr. White's text is, that he has perversely allowed it to continue disfigured by vulgarisms of grammar and spelling" (p. 252). "We regret Mr. White's glossological excursions the more because they are utterly supererogatory, and because they seem to imply a rashness of conclusion which can very seldom be laid to his charge as respects the text. He volunteers, without the least occasion for it, an opinion that *abye* and *abide* are the same word (which they are not), suggests that *vile* and *vild* (whose etymology, he says, is obscure) may be related to the Anglo-Saxon *hyldan*, and tells us that *dom* is Anglo-Saxon for *house*, etc." (pp. 253 f.). "But it is after Mr. White has been bitten by the *oestrum* of Shakspearian pronunciation that he becomes thoroughly contradictory of himself, especially after he has taken up the notion that *Much Ado About Nothing* is *Much Ado About Noting*, and that *th* was not sounded in the England of Shakspeare" (p. 254). This notion Lowell proves false, and exposes many other of White's inconsistencies and fantastic ideas. "We have been minute in criticising this part of Mr. White's notes, because we think his investigations misdirected, the results at which he arrives mistaken, and because we hope to persuade him to keep a tighter rein on his philological zeal in future." Whatever he has to say in that line would better appear in a separate treatise (p. 258).

In conclusion Lowell says: "We have subjected his volumes to a laborious examination such as few books receive, because the text of Shakspeare is a matter of common and great concern, and they have borne the trial, except in these few impertinent particulars, admirably. Mr. Dyce and Mr. Singer are only dry commonplace books of illustrative quotations; Mr. Collier has not wholly recovered from his 'Corr. fo'-madness; Mr. Knight is too diffuse; and we repeat our honest persuasion, that Mr. White has thus far

given us the best extant text, while the fullness of his notes gives his edition almost the value of a variorum" (p. 259).

Thus wrote James Russell Lowell in 1859. In 1882 Karl Knortz in his *Shakespeare in America* could affirm: "Einer der tüchtigsten lebenden Shakespeare-Kenner ist unstreitig Richard Grant White in New-York, dessen 1857-65 erschienene kritische Ausgabe der Werke des englischen Dramatikers epochemachend war" (p. 43). And in 1889 the September number of *Shakespeariana*, p. 395, affirms: "The edition published by Little, Brown & Co., and known as White's *Shakespeare*, was and is one of the most admirable editions ever printed."

In what sense, however, White's edition was epochmaking, the writer fails to understand. His aim was purity of text, conformity to the first folio. But this was not new, even in America. Peabody, Verplanck, and Hudson, not to mention many European editors, had openly stated that to be their object also, and claimed to have made careful collations with the original text. White merely continued in the same line as his predecessors, but performed his task better than they had done, while his keenness of intellect and legal training enabled him to argue out a few unsettled points to a plausible conclusion.

JANE SHERZER.